

A
TRUE COPY
OF A
LETTER

Lately Written by

Mr. DOWLEY

TO

Dr. WELLS,

And now published by Dr. WELLS,

Together with the

Doctor's ANSWER.

The Third Edition.

Imprimatur,

GUIL. DELAUNE

Vice-Can. OXON.

Pr. 10. 1706.

OXFORD,

Printed at the THEATER for *Jo. Stephens*, and are
to be sold by *James Knapton* at the Crown in
St. Paul's Church-Yard, London. 1706.

43.
8. 8.

298.



To

SIR

H

re. But
res not o
; and f
dustry a
nswer to
judge, v
tion of
lfness o
rty, and
ged in.
I can aff
l, that
ur Letter
Comma
e Specia
Before I
not but
Instanc
ange and
I cannot
ll be so
plying
the Sinf
y Exc
with me
y to M

To Mr. PETER DOWLEY.

SIR,

HAD the Letter you lately writ and sent to Me, related only to *My Self*, how Ill soever you have dealt with me therein, yet it should for my part have never seen any other Light, than that of the *Press*. But since your Letter is of *Publick Concern*, and relates not only to *My self*, but to the *Controversy* between us; and since you and your Followers have with great Industry and Assurance given out, that it contain'd a *Full Answer* to my *Two Printed Letters*; I leave it to the World to judge, whether I am not under an Indispensable Obligation of *Publishing* your Letter, that so I may *prove the Unfalseness* of the Rumour spread abroad by you and your Party, and *Vindicate the Goodness* of the Cause I am Engaged in.

I can assure you, Sir, that I have been most strictly Careful, that no Injustice should be done you by *Transcribing* your Letter, insomuch that I have not suffer'd a *single Letter Comma* to be *Alter'd*. And I have also desired, that the *Special Care* might be taken by the *Printer*.

Before I come to the Consideration of your Letter, I cannot but here Observe to you, how pregnant and lively Instance is afforded by you and your Followers, of the *Change* and deplorable *Obstinacy* of *Willfull Prejudice*.

I cannot but in Charity think that some of your Followers will be so just to Me, as to Bear me Witness, that upon applying my Self to them in order to convince them of the *Sinfullness* of their Separation, they with a seeming Modesty Excused themselves from *Arguing* thoroughly the *Matter* with me, adding that I would Do well to propose what I had to say to Mr. Dowley, and that they should very much Like to

have the Points in Controversy Fairly Debated Between Us, for their Satisfaction. Hereupon I drew up my Two Letters since Published: for though I knew there were Already extant many Excellent Discourses or Books on such Subjects yet I knew of No one that was *Suitable* either to my own Circumstances for to Purchase and Distribute, or to the Circumstances of my Dissenting Parishioners to Peruse and Read.

Now as I had thus Not refused to take (no inconsiderable) Pains at the Motion, and for the Satisfaction of your Followers aforesaid; So I did indeed Expect, and I think not without good Reason, that you likewise should have been Moved and Prevailed with by the same your Followers, Not to refuse to take the like Pains for their Satisfaction, namely by Putting into their Hands a Direct and Particular Answer of your Own to All the several Points made out in my Letters Against your and their Principles and Practices.

I leave the World to judge, whether This be Any other than what your Followers above specified stand in Honour Engaged to Press and Prevail on you to Do; or whether else They have not Good Reason to suspect that their Cause is Very Bad, since you their Leader are Afraid to Appeal Publicly in It's Behalf; and therefore whether They have not Good Reason to Quit and Renounce both it and You. Is it not then most Strange, and no other way to be accounted for but by the Badness of your Cause, and the unreasonable Obstinacy and Blindness of Prejudice, that you Sir, for your part should Content your Self to Do no more than Send me a Written Letter together with De Laune's Plea for the Non-conformists; and your Followers on their part should presently be Contented (without so much as the Seeing or Reading of your Letter, and only) with a bare implicit (and so Popish) Belief of your Letter's containing a Satisfactory Answer to my Printed Letters?

That nothing may be wanting in me to Convince you and your Followers of such (your and their) unwarrantable Prejudice and Partiality, I shall consider Each Case distinctly; and out of Respect to you, Sir, I shall give you Case the First Place.

To Mr. Peter Dowley.

5

Your Letter then may (as will appear hereafter) be distinguished into Three General parts, viz. *Bare Confident Assertions* intermixt with *Uncivil Language*; *Sham* or downright *False Reasons* for your Not Appearing in Print; and *Hints* (as you call them) of What Feats you Could Atchieve, were you but pleased to be in the Mind.

Whether I have not Abundantly Proved below, that your Reasons are no other than *meer Pretences* or *Downright Falsities*; and that the Hints you have given, expose (not *fine*, but) *your own Nakedness*; let the impartial and judicious Reader determine. As for the other general Part of your Letter; I am very well content to be altogether Outdone by you, viz. Both as to *Bare Confidence of Assertion*, and also to *Incivility of Language* or *Treatment*. Thus much for your Own Letter here in general.

As for *De Laune's Plea* &c. sent with your Letter, I make you this *very fair Offer*, that if you shall think fit to put forth any Treatise by way of *Proof* (of what you pretend, viz.) that the said Plea is a full Answer to my Letters, then I will thereby publickly engage my self (by God's Blessing) to shew that you are very much mistaken, and that *De Laune's Plea* though somewhat *Bulky in Volume*, yet is very *Scanty as to* *and Argument*, and) doth not disprove Any One Point Asserted in my Letters. And the same Offer that I here make you in reference to *De Laune's Plea*, I make you likewise in reference to the other Books (referred to in your Letter, viz.) of *Dr. Owen*, *Mr. Baxter*, *Mr. Clarkson*, *Mr. Alsop*, &c. And this is all you or your Followers can in Reason possibly expect of me, till you make the way for my actually performing what I here engage: for I am now only to attend your Motions.

Lastly, supposing Any of the Books aforementioned did contain a full Answer to my Letters, yet are you, Sir, assured that your Followers have (or have you given your self the trouble to take care that they should have) it for to read and give you Satisfaction? Moreover, are you not perswaded, that what is said more largely in any of the aforesaid Books, might be brought into narrower Compass, and also might some other ways be render'd more suitable to the Circumstances

of your Followers? And therefore how can you acquit your self from taking (on such an Occasion) a little more than ordinary Pains for the Greater Benefit of your Party? Do you hereby approve your self to be a Labourer in the Vineyard? And now I have mention'd this Comparison of the Church to a Vineyard, it brings to my mind what seems to be the most natural, and so best Account of your being so sparing of your Labour. For you well know, that though there is need of a great deal of Pains to dress and keep Vines in due order, so as to bring forth Good Fruit; and not in time to Degenerate so far as to Bring forth Wild Grapes: yet on the other hand Briers and Thorns require no such Care to make them thrive, or to keep them from Turning or Altering so as to bear Good Fruit.

From what has been said, may appear the Strength of your own Prejudice, and Greatness of your own Partiality, in Refusing to give my Letters their due Consideration, and in Contenting your self with what you have done, and is already mention'd. I now proceed to the Case of your Followers, and to lay open the Obstinate Prejudice and Partiality whereby they are carried away from Rightly Considering what I have offer'd to them in my Printed Letters, and are forc'd at least to make shew of their being fully Contented and Satisfied even with your doing nothing for their Satisfaction.

I desire then of your Followers only to give me a Direct and Sincere Answer (as before God) to this Question "Whether, supposing upon the Motion of any of them you had Publickly propos'd to me your Objections against our Communion and I had declined Returning you a Publick Answer, you would not presently have run away with full cry that (whatsoever I might Pretend, the only True Reason, why I did not answer you Publickly was because) I Could not, or was Afraid to, Answer you Publickly? But now 'tis evident to the meanest Capacity that for Persons to think Well of the very same thing in One man, which they would think Ill of in Another man, can be the Effect only of unreasonable, and therefore unjustifiable Prejudice and Partiality.

And as the Behaviour of the Generality of your Party is thus Highly Blameable, so this sort of Behaviour in the

To Mr. *Peter Dowley.*

7

who moved me to Do what I have Done, is further *Aggra-*
vated, as being Accusable of *Insincerity* as well as Preju-
dice and Partiality. For, whatever Specious Shew they
made to me of being *Willing to have Matters in Debate fairly*
Discussed, 'tis now apparent, that all the while they meant
no other than what some of your Party have not been
ashamed to *Declare Openly* to this effect, viz. that *Let me*
Write what I would, they were Resolved to Continue as they Are.
However God forbid that I should cease to Pray for and Endea-
vour their Repentance and Amendment. And so I come
to the Consideration of the Letter you, Sir, were pleased
to write to me, which I shall consider (for the Reader's
ease) Paragraph by Paragraph.

A 2

A True

A True Copy
OF
Mr. DOWLEY'S
LETTER
TO
Dr. WELLS,
Together with the Doctor's ANSWER

Mr. DOWLEY'S Letter.

REVd. SIR

I Received 2 : printed letters from you, the one directed to me of your own parish, & the other particularly to me, the meaning of your sending such things to me (of whom you have no knowledge but only by common fame) I can no otherwise interpret, but that either you are so conceited of your performance that you think all the dissenters must needs be thunder struck, & down convinced at the sight of your papers, or else that you would invite me to write by way of answer to the subject of your letters:

Dr. WELLS'S Answer.

That I have no other knowledge of you, Sir, but by common Fame (or what I have heard from Others, more especially

own Followers,) I readily allow: and surely you must know, that this is Ground Enough and Enough to Know to be a Dissenting Teacher, and Him whom my Dissenting Prisoners follow, and therefore Ground Enough to Send Such Things as my two printed Letters. Pray what things would you reasonably expect I should Send you, but Such things? Indeed I understand by Common Fame, that the more Affectionate of your Party frequently send you Other things, which I easily imagine agree much better with your Stomach and Constitution, than What I sent. For 'tis pretty manifest from your own Letter, that what I sent did not digest well, but put you Out of order, and Into a kind of Fever: which is the Best Excuse that can be made for your charitable Interpretation of the Meaning of my sending my Letters to you.

For your words are [the meaning of your sending such things to me I can no otherwise interpret, but that either you are so conceited with your Performance &c.] Now had you, Sir, but a very small portion of the Charity, so much talked of by your Party, you would have been induced thereby to have otherwise interpreted the Meaning of my sending such things to you, and to have had some more candid Regard to my Solemn Declarations, that I had never troubled you or my Patrons with my printed Letters, but in order (to do what in me lay) to undeceive you and them as to your usual Errors and Practices.

In short, Sir, I leave you or the most quick-sighted of your Followers to find out in Either of my Letters One downright unmannerly Personal Reflection, as you are taxed out of your sort of Charity and Moderation to bestow on me, viz. Being Conceited with my Own Performance. That I was a Non-Conformist to the Rules of Church-Decency, I saw indeed afore by Common Fame; but I confess I did not know, till I learnt so much from your own Letter, that I was likewise a Non-Conformist to the Rules of Common-Civility and Good Manners.

Well, but in what degree do you suppose me to be Convinced of my Own Performance? Why, so as to think All the dissenters must needs be Thunder-Struck, and fall down Convinced

Mr. Dowley's Letter,

at the Sight of my Papers. Truly, Sir, was my Conceit in this your Expression, it would be very High and Affecting. Pray don't your Sermons usually run in this strain of Excess? And may it not be well supposed, that 'tis on account of such your Mighty and Thunder-Striking Expressions that your Hearers by virtue of their Unquestionable judgement have Dubbed you with the Admired Title of a Powerful Teacher?

As to the Dissenters being Thunder-struck, I hear with wish they did not give so just occasion to think that they are so, at least as the Word is sometimes used to denote, viz. Being Deprived of Right Reason and Understanding.

And as to the Dissenters Falling down Convinced at the Sight of my Papers, you have unawares given an Intimation that you well understand how they are wont to be Convinced viz. by Shew and Appearance, not by Reason and Argument. Indeed I wish I had not Cause to Fear, that Some of them if ever they are Convinced, must be so only At the Sight of my Papers; forasmuch as they are so carried away with Prejudice, as Not to Afford my Papers the Reading, as they ought: in Conscience.

I shall now leave the World to judge, whether you are not a very Bad and Uncharitable Interpreter hitherto; and proceed to your other Interpretation, that I would Intreat you to Write by way of Answer to the Subject of my Letter. However you please to Deal with me, I shall be very careful to do you Justice; and therefore freely own, that you are in the Right as to This Interpretation, as much as you are in the Wrong as to the Other. And I leave it to the judgement of the Reader, whether you have alledged any tolerable Reason for Not Writing and Publishing an Answer. We see then what follows in your Letter.

MR. DOWLEY'S Letter.

As to the former, I must truly say I meet with no conviction from them, but rather much confirmation in my judgement & Esteem, when I see such a Mr. & Dr. of the Church coming forward in the defence of it, with so much ignorance weakness & mistakes.

With Dr. Wells's Answer.

II

blushes me that the truth is on our side, when one of such de-
in the University has so little of moment to say against us.

Dr. WELLS'S Answer.

As to your meeting with no Conviction &c. from my Letters,
most Proper to refer it to the Determination of Impartial
ges, whether the True Cause thereof is to be ascribed to
Weakness of my Arguments, or to the Strength of your Pre-
ce.

I shall therefore only observe, that, had there been (in
Few Lines of your Letter immediately foregoing,) as
ch Proof of what you lay to my Charge, as there is Course,
ot Ill Language; I am sure I ought to have Blushed. But
there is only very Course, not to say Ill Language, and
Proof; pray consider whether you ought not to Blush.

If my Ignorance, Weakness, and Mistake be so Great as you
ould have it thought, 'tis the more Easy for you to Ex-
and Shew It: and if I have said so Little of Moment against
'tis the sooner Answered. And therefore why will you
lip the Opportunity of a Publick Victory and Triumph?
are say, and Others will be apt to think, that such
r Conduct is not owing to Any Kindness to Me.

You would do well to call to mind, that an Army,
ch keeps close within it's Entrenchments, and refuses to joyn
le in the Open Field, when 'tis fairly offer'd by the Op-
te Side, is with very Good Reason counted to be the
kest in Reality, how much soever it may Decry the Ene-
Strength, and Boast of it's Own, or whatever Pretences it
give out for so Acting. Whatever you please to think
ny Ignorance, I will however be so Civil to you, Sir,
o suppose, that your Ignorance is not so Great, but that
know how to make the Application to your self; and
efore I shall go on to Consider the Reasons urged by
for your not Publishing an Answer to my Letters.

Mr. DOWLEY'S Letter.

And as to the other, many reasons withhold me from writing
ckly at this time, the Queens most excellent majesty hath so oft
ed from the throne her desire that all her subjects should live in
love

love & peace, that I shall not lightly take up the bone of contention; persons should shew more manners to the government they live under, then to scatter strife when the royal authority calls them to unity & concord.

Dr. WELLS's Answer.

Since you say, Sir, that *Many Reasons With-hold* you and are pleased to mention but three or four, which *very far from being Good ones*; it may be well inferr'd, that the Others must be *Extremely Bad ones*, and therefore I acted prudently in keeping them to your self. Besides, you do you intimate, that you are with-holden from Writing Publickly at *This time* more than you may be at any Time hereafter as long as you or I can probably expect to live.

Her most Excellent Majesty, as She hath Often signified Already, so I heartily pray God that She may Live On Again to Signify from the Throne Her most highly Commendable Desire that *All her Subjects should live in Love and Peace, Unity and Concord*. And sure I am that the Only Design of my Letters was to Promote Love and Peace, Unity and Concord by Endeavouring what I could to Remove the Chief Occasion of our Unhappy Discords. If my Letters have a Contrary Effect on you, the Fault is only yours; if you cannot turn an Answer without an Unchristian Contention, or without the like Meekness and Calmness as my Letters were written with, 'tis the Unhappiness of your Temper. But pray have not been more for your Credit, to have Concealed your Unhappiness of Temper, than to have thus Discover'd, that 'tis impossible for you to Answer, without Snarling like a Dog about a Bone?

As to the Admonition you take upon you to give, I know No One in All these Parts that stands in need of it, but only your self; and therefore be pleased to Do as We say, and to Practise as one that knows that Persons should shew more Manners to the Government they live under, than to Propagate and Scatter Strife, and keep up Unnecessary and Sinfull Divisions by their Separate Congregations, when the Royal Authority calls them to Unity and Concord, and therefore more especially to Church-Unity, as being the most principal and the only true Basis of All Other Unity whatever.

ight instance, Sir, in other Respects, wherein you fall
of shewing Manners to the Government, so far as much as
abuse it's Gracious Clemency towards you, by going about
ong your Followers to Pervert and Wrest the Toleration
Not-Passing of the Occasional Bill, into an Argument, that
Separation is approved of by the Government. I omit also
ther instance, which might shew, that whatever Respect
pretend to have for the Government, you have howe-
much Greater Respect for your Money. And would it
se God to Enable you by his Grace to Despise these
Particulars, Money and Temporal Interest, I should have
at Hopes of your being Still Convinced by my Letters or
e such other Means.

this, Sir, is Enough to Shew the Weakness and In-
ciency of your First Reason for Not writing Publickly at
Time. Go we on to your second Reason.

Mr. DOWLEY's Letter.

there is enough writ on the subject already to satisfy those that
willing to receive light, and those that willfully shut their eyes
shall have no hope to enlighten, by any thing that may be far-
said, had you perused the dissenters defence of themselves
ished by Dr Owen Mr Baxter Mr Clarkson Mr Alsop & di-
others, you might have seen your self answered before you
e, and therefore it's needless to write again, till something of
h not considered is brought forth, of which sort I see nothing
our letters.

Dr. WELLS's Answer.

may as easily Deny as you, Sir, Affirm, that there is
ugh Writ (I mean) on your side already to Satisfie those that
Willing to receive light. And I assure you, that I do not will-
shut my eyes, and therefore you may have hope to Enlighten
by Any thing that you shall please to say Further and
aducive to that End.

s for the Writings of the Dissenters, Dr. Owen, Mr.
er, Mr. Clarkson, Mr. Alsop &c. it might be Enough to
ly, that had you perused Dr. Stillingfleet's Unreasonable-
of Separation, and the Cases of the London Divines, or the
ridgement of them, and other Treatises of our Writers
publish'd

publish'd since the Writings you refer to; you might have
 that I could not see my self answer'd before I wrote, and therefore
 that 'tis not needless for you to write still. But I rather choos'd
 alledge, that tho' you may be so Partial as never to L
 into any of Our Writers, yet I may know more of yo
 writers than you may imagine, and I had (by God's Ble
 ing) given you a Publick Proof thereof by this time, ha
 not been called off to this Consideration of your Lett
 On which account I must desire your Patience a litt
 longer for that Tract, which, when it comes forth, w
 be a Further Evidence that I could not see my self Answer
 before I wrote, and that 'tis not needless for you to write, for
 there is something brought forth in my Letters of so much Wor
 as to be Owned and Maintained as True by the foremention
 Dr. Owen, Mr. Baxter, &c. tho' Denied, and Not Practis'd
 you and your Followers.

Thus you may see, if you will not shut your eyes, that
 ther will your second Reason acquit you from Writing P
 blickly at this time by way of Answer to my Letters. Take
 now the third Reason under Consideration.

Mr. DOWLEY's Letter.

The case of that unhappy Gent: (the author of the book hereto
 inclosed) abundantly shews what disadvantage the dissenters lie
 under in writing, though never so much called upon & provoked ther
 to, they have been answered with prisons & penaltys & not m
 arguments, and therefore there is not room for them to writ
 freely and fully on their case as the matter would lead them, and
 their adversaries may against them, they may say tolle legem
 fiat disputatio; but while things are so hedged about with pe
 laws it is not safe for them to write.

Dr. WELLS's Answer.

Mr. De Laune was indeed very Unhappy (not only as
 the Misfortune of his Latter end, but also) as to his Prin
 ples and Practices, and particularly as to his Plea for
 Non-Conformists, it being One of the Meanest pieces ev
 of that kind, and therefore methinks you have Disparag'd
 your Judgment in choosing to send me that Book bel
 for

other of your own Writers. Sir, I can assure you I had (afore I received that which you sent) perused in this Twelve-month the said Book; and that I read it more carefully than your self, I believe I can submit so Good a Proof as will amount to a Demonstration. Had you ever Read but the very first page in the Book after the Title-leaf, you must there have found at Bottom of the page a Plain Direct Contradiction to what I so Confidently affirm in the part of your Letter last sent, as will appear by placing what you say and what is said together side by side thus,

Mr. Dowley's Words.

The Publisher (of Mr. De Laune's Words.

There is not Room for them (the Dissenters) to Write freely and Fully on their Case; the Master would lead them, as their Adversaries may justly say, They may say, legem & fiat Disputabitur while things are so managed about with Penal Laws, it is not Safe for them to Write.

Blessed be God, We now live in a more Mild and Gentle Reign; in which it will not be accounted Criminal for Men in a Sober and Modest manner, to Declare the Grounds and Reasons of their Faith.

Don't you see, Sir, what an Extraordinary Agreement there is between what is said in your Letter, and in the Book sent with it? If what you have chosen and sent me as your own Evidence, will thus give in Witness Against and what you design'd to be your own Voucher will plainly Give you the Ly I cannot Help it, and you can see only your own Imprudence and Disingenuity in the use of such Fallacious Arguments.

Certainly, Sir, had you not too much Relied on my Ignorance, you would not have ventur'd to Argue at this late rate, viz. ' Mr. De Laune and the other Dissenters should not Write with Freedom and Safety in their own Defence when they incur'd the Punishments once annexed to the breach of the Penal Laws: Therefore I Mr. Dowley cannot write with Freedom and Safety in my Own Defence Now when the

" Penal

"*Penal Laws are disarm'd of their Sanction, that the Dissenters*
 "incur no Penalties by the Violation of them; but Liberty of
 "Press as well as of Conscience is Granted to them. Had I
 ever enjoy'd the Happiness of an University-Education,
 my own Natural Reason would of it self have Enabled
 to Discover the Falseness of your foregoing Arguments.
 And I dare say you were Bred at a Separate (if at Any) Aca-
 demy: forasmuch as from your way of Arguing all along
 your Letter, it may be well inferr'd, that you are a Dissenter
 from the *Established Rules of Reason as well as Religion.*

Moreover, is it not evident from this Instance, that
 you, Sir, your self (as well as your Followers) are sometimes
 Convinced only at the Sight of Papers and Books? For I
 you gone but one Page beyond the Title-Page of Mr.
Laune's Plea, you must have found the forementioned
 contradiction to what you say in your Letter. And therefore
 may it not be very reasonably inferred, that you (Gentle-
 man, out of your sincere Impartiality) troubled your self
 look no further, but presently Fell down Convinced (only
 the Sight of the Title to Mr. *De Laune's Book*) that what
 I allowed was without all doubt Answerable thereunto, and
 so a sufficient Plea for the Non-Conformists? On this account
 I must beg leave to put this Question to you, whether you
 are not Convinced after the same manner, that the Works of
 Dr. Owen, Mr. Baxter &c. are just Defences of your Separation,
 namely, because you have Seen, or perhaps only Heard
 some such Title to their Books? And hence your Followers
 may (and Others will) gather, what little Stress or Weight
 to be given to your Recommendation of a Book, since your
 Knowledge of It may be thus well suspected to be no other
 than what may be most properly called only Superficial.

It appears then from what has been said, that what you
 mention in your Letter as the third Argument for your
 Not Writing Publickly is (even by the Testimony of the
 very Book you sent with it and Appeal to) a Demonstrable
 Untruth, and so No Argument. And therefore it appears
 also, that you might very well have Spared that Scrap
 of Latin, *Tolle Legem & fiat Disputatio*; there being no
 manner of Occasion for it, unless you would have

look

oked up
 in Tong
 Scrap of
 learning in
 Lastly,
 at again p
 ention'd.
 at Shew v
 ad of A
 ously in
 ur old
 l that is
 nal Law
 ou woul
 on of, fo
 rt of Dis
 tent you
 yn Breth
 a Sober a
 o; for i
 nfine you
 odesty.
 'Tis tim
 eason for

What is
 mainly i
 d what
 ation, you
 re to say
 fise your
 n, your p
 monies (n
 en to the
 theirs.

In this
 ont to de

oked upon as an Evidence of your *Great skill in the Latin Tongue*. And if so, why did you not add likewise a *Scrap of Greek and Hebrew* for Proofs, of your *Profound Learning* in those Two Languages?

Lastly, in reference to this Part of your Letter I cannot but again put you in mind of your own *Admonition* above-mentioned, and desire you to consider, whether you do not shew very *Little manners* to the Government, whilst (instead of *Returning Due Thanks* for the *Great Liberty* graciously indulged to your Party) you still continue on your old *Murmurings and Complaints*, that you are (after all that is *Already done* for you) *too much Hedged in with Penal Laws*. Sir, hereby you make it pretty plain, *What* you would be *At*; *What* is the *Time* you stay in expectation of, for to *Write Publickly* in; and of *What Stamp* or sort of *Dissenters* you are of. But pray, *What liberty* will content you? you have heard above from One of your Brethren, that you may *Now Write Freely and Safely* in a *Sober and Modest manner*. And is not that Enough?; for it seems you are of such a *Temper*, that you cannot confine your Pen within the *Narrow Bounds* of *Sobriety and Modesty*.

'Tis time then now to proceed to your last pretended reason for Not *Answering me Publickly*.

Mr. DOWLEY's Letter.

What is matter of argument in your papers (which is but little) mainly the same that the papists plead against the protestants, and what you would reply to them in the defence of the reformation, you may answer your selfe withall as to the most you have to say against us, upon the same principles that you can justify your selves against Rome, we can justify our selves against you, your pretending to make us false teachers for opposing your ceremonies (which is all the evidence you give in that point) lays you open to the papists to prove you the same for your leaving any theirs.

Dr. WELLS's Answer.

In this paragraph you do, Sir, much as Children are wont to do, when they go about to save themselves from
B telling

telling a downright *Ly*, by adding to what they say an [Almost] or the like. For what else is the design of your slipping in [Mainly] in one place, and in another [as to the most] but to keep your self off as well as you could from maintaining a *Notorious Untruth*, and yet to seem to say Something, which however amounts at last to Nothing.

For *We defend our Reformation*, and justify our selves against *Rome*, by proving that the *Roman Church* imposes *Sinfull Terms of Communion*, such as the *Belief of Transubstantiation, Purgatory, Worshipping of Saints and Images &c.* But how can you have the Face to say, that you can justify your selves *Against Us* on the like account? Doth our Church impose such or any other *Sinfull Term of Communion*? Have I not under the *Fourth Head* of my *First Letter* particularly consider'd the *Common Objections* made by your Party, and prov'd that *Nothing that you object against us is Sinfull*? And therefore it lies upon you to Disprove what I have there said.

Again, Sir, how can you so *Confidently* affirm that *All the Evidence I give as to the point of your being a False Teacher*, is taken from your *Opposing Ceremonies*? Either you have not Read the *Second Head* of my *Letter* to your self, or else you must know that I prove you to be a *False Teacher* on account also of your *Teaching by a False Mission*. And what I have said hereupon, you are to *Disprove*, before you can justify your self against Us, by the same Principles *We justify our selves against the Papists*.

Nay, under the *First Head* of my *Letter* to your self, prove you to be a *False Teacher* on account of *Falseness of Doctrine*, in *Opposing the Obedience* due to the *Governours of the Church* in things lawfull, and in *Teaching or incouraging the People* to leave their true and rightfull *Ministers*, and to follow you out of a wrong opinion of your being more *Gifted*, and in other Points, which surely are more than *Ceremonies*. And therefore your *Opposing Ceremonies* is not the only evidence I give in for to make you a *False Teacher*.

I do indeed under the *First Head* of my *Second Letter* instance in some *Ceremonies*, as *Kneeling &c.* And surely

whosoever
tain it
thing, b
Nor doe
such Cere
a very fa
False Tea
Reasons,
our Cere
And t
and last
Inferenc

For the
in this h
ers answe
nt greater
drawing m
eady giv
ess, as t

I have
y Letter
Letter test
One that
t least to
do Fling
But pr
appear to
you have
a print,
have not
s for the
ne Cont
adge, w
ents.

Besides

whosoever

Whosoever Opposes even a bare Ceremony so, as to maintain it to be Sinfull, when the Scripture says no such thing, but even approves of it, is so far forth a *False Teacher*. Nor does the *Church of England* do so in respect of *Any* such Ceremony used by the *Church of Rome*: and therefore 'tis a very false Assertion to say, that the *Papists* may prove Us *False Teachers* for *Leaving Any* of their Ceremonies by the same Reasons, that we prove you to be *False Teachers* for *Opposing* our Ceremonies.

And thus I have shewn the Insufficiency of your fourth and last Reason for *Not Writing Publickly*. Next for your Inference from All taken together.

Mr. DOWLEY's Letter.

For these considerations I forbear at present appearing in print on this head, and though you shall burden the presse with your letters answerable to the months of the year, yet I assure you (without greater occasion appear) you shall faile of your expectation of drawing me to the presse on that matter; not but that you have already given abundant room and advantage to expose your nakedness, as the few following hints may serve for all the rest.

Dr. WELLS's Answer.

I have, Sir, Letters by me, which as plainly testify that my Letters have been *No Burdens* to the *Press*, as your own Letter testifies them to be *Heavy Burdens* to you, who act like One that wanting *Strength* to bear his *Burden* as he ought, or at least to *Ease himself* of it *Handsomely*, without any more do Flings it off in a great *Passion*.

But pray, Sir, what *Greater Occasion* would you have appear to Draw you to the *Press*? As for the *Considerations* you have mention'd for your *Forbearing* at present to appear in print, let the *Impartial Reader* Judge, whether they have not been already proved to be *No Considerations*; and as for the few *Arguments* you offer below in reference to the Controversy between us, let the same Reader also Judge, whether they are not there proved to be *No Arguments*.

Besides, Sir, you your self mention a very *Good Occasion*

Mr. Dowley's Letter,

to Draw you to the Press, were it so as you say, viz. that I have given Abundant room and advantage to expose my nakedness. I am much afraid, lest your Own Conscience tells you, that you do not really Think so as you have Written; for else I dare say you would not refuse to Take what is Given you: and (pray) Confess ingenuously, whether this be not the very first time, that ever you did Refuse to Take a Gift?

Well, but though you think not fit to take Advantage of me Publickly, or to Print a Full Answer to my Letters; yet you are willing Privately to let me see, what you Could do with me, if you would, by the Few following Hints, which are such Extraordinary Feats as that they may serve for All the Rest. Now then for Dint of Argument.

Mr. DOWLEY's Letter.

You seem to glory in christ's example of prayer in his agony, as your Achilles to justifie formes in that duty, whereas really nothing doth make more against them, for it is evident christ prayed then according to the present occasion and exercise of his spirit, and so indeed all prayer ought to be and all that we read of in scripture really was so, but no stinzed formes can reach all occasions that may happen, not those whose perfection is so much cryed up by the admirers of them, for upon all new publicke occasions there are still new ones made: christ's using the same words the 3 severall times he prayed upon that head of his sufferings, makes nothing for you, for that may be and oft is used in extempore prayer, expressing the desire by the same words, when there is occasion to pray oft for the same mercy, and you may as well argue from christ's preaching to have formes of sermons, as from his praying to have such in that duty, for he oft repeated the same expressions in his doctrine as well as in his devotion, as may be seen Math: 5: 21: 27: 33: 38: 40: 41: 42: 43: 44: 45: 46: 47: 48: 49: 50: 51: 52: 53: 54: 55: 56: 57: 58: 59: 60: 61: 62: 63: 64: 65: 66: 67: 68: 69: 70: 71: 72: 73: 74: 75: 76: 77: 78: 79: 80: 81: 82: 83: 84: 85: 86: 87: 88: 89: 90: 91: 92: 93: 94: 95: 96: 97: 98: 99: 100: 101: 102: 103: 104: 105: 106: 107: 108: 109: 110: 111: 112: 113: 114: 115: 116: 117: 118: 119: 120: 121: 122: 123: 124: 125: 126: 127: 128: 129: 130: 131: 132: 133: 134: 135: 136: 137: 138: 139: 140: 141: 142: 143: 144: 145: 146: 147: 148: 149: 150: 151: 152: 153: 154: 155: 156: 157: 158: 159: 160: 161: 162: 163: 164: 165: 166: 167: 168: 169: 170: 171: 172: 173: 174: 175: 176: 177: 178: 179: 180: 181: 182: 183: 184: 185: 186: 187: 188: 189: 190: 191: 192: 193: 194: 195: 196: 197: 198: 199: 200: 201: 202: 203: 204: 205: 206: 207: 208: 209: 210: 211: 212: 213: 214: 215: 216: 217: 218: 219: 220: 221: 222: 223: 224: 225: 226: 227: 228: 229: 230: 231: 232: 233: 234: 235: 236: 237: 238: 239: 240: 241: 242: 243: 244: 245: 246: 247: 248: 249: 250: 251: 252: 253: 254: 255: 256: 257: 258: 259: 260: 261: 262: 263: 264: 265: 266: 267: 268: 269: 270: 271: 272: 273: 274: 275: 276: 277: 278: 279: 280: 281: 282: 283: 284: 285: 286: 287: 288: 289: 290: 291: 292: 293: 294: 295: 296: 297: 298: 299: 300: 301: 302: 303: 304: 305: 306: 307: 308: 309: 310: 311: 312: 313: 314: 315: 316: 317: 318: 319: 320: 321: 322: 323: 324: 325: 326: 327: 328: 329: 330: 331: 332: 333: 334: 335: 336: 337: 338: 339: 340: 341: 342: 343: 344: 345: 346: 347: 348: 349: 350: 351: 352: 353: 354: 355: 356: 357: 358: 359: 360: 361: 362: 363: 364: 365: 366: 367: 368: 369: 370: 371: 372: 373: 374: 375: 376: 377: 378: 379: 380: 381: 382: 383: 384: 385: 386: 387: 388: 389: 390: 391: 392: 393: 394: 395: 396: 397: 398: 399: 400: 401: 402: 403: 404: 405: 406: 407: 408: 409: 410: 411: 412: 413: 414: 415: 416: 417: 418: 419: 420: 421: 422: 423: 424: 425: 426: 427: 428: 429: 430: 431: 432: 433: 434: 435: 436: 437: 438: 439: 440: 441: 442: 443: 444: 445: 446: 447: 448: 449: 450: 451: 452: 453: 454: 455: 456: 457: 458: 459: 460: 461: 462: 463: 464: 465: 466: 467: 468: 469: 470: 471: 472: 473: 474: 475: 476: 477: 478: 479: 480: 481: 482: 483: 484: 485: 486: 487: 488: 489: 490: 491: 492: 493: 494: 495: 496: 497: 498: 499: 500: 501: 502: 503: 504: 505: 506: 507: 508: 509: 510: 511: 512: 513: 514: 515: 516: 517: 518: 519: 520: 521: 522: 523: 524: 525: 526: 527: 528: 529: 530: 531: 532: 533: 534: 535: 536: 537: 538: 539: 540: 541: 542: 543: 544: 545: 546: 547: 548: 549: 550: 551: 552: 553: 554: 555: 556: 557: 558: 559: 560: 561: 562: 563: 564: 565: 566: 567: 568: 569: 570: 571: 572: 573: 574: 575: 576: 577: 578: 579: 580: 581: 582: 583: 584: 585: 586: 587: 588: 589: 590: 591: 592: 593: 594: 595: 596: 597: 598: 599: 600: 601: 602: 603: 604: 605: 606: 607: 608: 609: 610: 611: 612: 613: 614: 615: 616: 617: 618: 619: 620: 621: 622: 623: 624: 625: 626: 627: 628: 629: 630: 631: 632: 633: 634: 635: 636: 637: 638: 639: 640: 641: 642: 643: 644: 645: 646: 647: 648: 649: 650: 651: 652: 653: 654: 655: 656: 657: 658: 659: 660: 661: 662: 663: 664: 665: 666: 667: 668: 669: 670: 671: 672: 673: 674: 675: 676: 677: 678: 679: 680: 681: 682: 683: 684: 685: 686: 687: 688: 689: 690: 691: 692: 693: 694: 695: 696: 697: 698: 699: 700: 701: 702: 703: 704: 705: 706: 707: 708: 709: 710: 711: 712: 713: 714: 715: 716: 717: 718: 719: 720: 721: 722: 723: 724: 725: 726: 727: 728: 729: 730: 731: 732: 733: 734: 735: 736: 737: 738: 739: 740: 741: 742: 743: 744: 745: 746: 747: 748: 749: 750: 751: 752: 753: 754: 755: 756: 757: 758: 759: 760: 761: 762: 763: 764: 765: 766: 767: 768: 769: 770: 771: 772: 773: 774: 775: 776: 777: 778: 779: 780: 781: 782: 783: 784: 785: 786: 787: 788: 789: 790: 791: 792: 793: 794: 795: 796: 797: 798: 799: 800: 801: 802: 803: 804: 805: 806: 807: 808: 809: 810: 811: 812: 813: 814: 815: 816: 817: 818: 819: 820: 821: 822: 823: 824: 825: 826: 827: 828: 829: 830: 831: 832: 833: 834: 835: 836: 837: 838: 839: 840: 841: 842: 843: 844: 845: 846: 847: 848: 849: 850: 851: 852: 853: 854: 855: 856: 857: 858: 859: 860: 861: 862: 863: 864: 865: 866: 867: 868: 869: 870: 871: 872: 873: 874: 875: 876: 877: 878: 879: 880: 881: 882: 883: 884: 885: 886: 887: 888: 889: 890: 891: 892: 893: 894: 895: 896: 897: 898: 899: 900: 901: 902: 903: 904: 905: 906: 907: 908: 909: 910: 911: 912: 913: 914: 915: 916: 917: 918: 919: 920: 921: 922: 923: 924: 925: 926: 927: 928: 929: 930: 931: 932: 933: 934: 935: 936: 937: 938: 939: 940: 941: 942: 943: 944: 945: 946: 947: 948: 949: 950: 951: 952: 953: 954: 955: 956: 957: 958: 959: 960: 961: 962: 963: 964: 965: 966: 967: 968: 969: 970: 971: 972: 973: 974: 975: 976: 977: 978: 979: 980: 981: 982: 983: 984: 985: 986: 987: 988: 989: 990: 991: 992: 993: 994: 995: 996: 997: 998: 999: 1000: 1001: 1002: 1003: 1004: 1005: 1006: 1007: 1008: 1009: 1010: 1011: 1012: 1013: 1014: 1015: 1016: 1017: 1018: 1019: 1020: 1021: 1022: 1023: 1024: 1025: 1026: 1027: 1028: 1029: 1030: 1031: 1032: 1033: 1034: 1035: 1036: 1037: 1038: 1039: 1040: 1041: 1042: 1043: 1044: 1045: 1046: 1047: 1048: 1049: 1050: 1051: 1052: 1053: 1054: 1055: 1056: 1057: 1058: 1059: 1060: 1061: 1062: 1063: 1064: 1065: 1066: 1067: 1068: 1069: 1070: 1071: 1072: 1073: 1074: 1075: 1076: 1077: 1078: 1079: 1080: 1081: 1082: 1083: 1084: 1085: 1086: 1087: 1088: 1089: 1090: 1091: 1092: 1093: 1094: 1095: 1096: 1097: 1098: 1099: 1100: 1101: 1102: 1103: 1104: 1105: 1106: 1107: 1108: 1109: 1110: 1111: 1112: 1113: 1114: 1115: 1116: 1117: 1118: 1119: 1120: 1121: 1122: 1123: 1124: 1125: 1126: 1127: 1128: 1129: 1130: 1131: 1132: 1133: 1134: 1135: 1136: 1137: 1138: 1139: 1140: 1141: 1142: 1143: 1144: 1145: 1146: 1147: 1148: 1149: 1150: 1151: 1152: 1153: 1154: 1155: 1156: 1157: 1158: 1159: 1160: 1161: 1162: 1163: 1164: 1165: 1166: 1167: 1168: 1169: 1170: 1171: 1172: 1173: 1174: 1175: 1176: 1177: 1178: 1179: 1180: 1181: 1182: 1183: 1184: 1185: 1186: 1187: 1188: 1189: 1190: 1191: 1192: 1193: 1194: 1195: 1196: 1197: 1198: 1199: 1200: 1201: 1202: 1203: 1204: 1205: 1206: 1207: 1208: 1209: 1210: 1211: 1212: 1213: 1214: 1215: 1216: 1217: 1218: 1219: 1220: 1221: 1222: 1223: 1224: 1225: 1226: 1227: 1228: 1229: 1230: 1231: 1232: 1233: 1234: 1235: 1236: 1237: 1238: 1239: 1240: 1241: 1242: 1243: 1244: 1245: 1246: 1247: 1248: 1249: 1250: 1251: 1252: 1253: 1254: 1255: 1256: 1257: 1258: 1259: 1260: 1261: 1262: 1263: 1264: 1265: 1266: 1267: 1268: 1269: 1270: 1271: 1272: 1273: 1274: 1275: 1276: 1277: 1278: 1279: 1280: 1281: 1282: 1283: 1284: 1285: 1286: 1287: 1288: 1289: 1290: 1291: 1292: 1293: 1294: 1295: 1296: 1297: 1298: 1299: 1300: 1301: 1302: 1303: 1304: 1305: 1306: 1307: 1308: 1309: 1310: 1311: 1312: 1313: 1314: 1315: 1316: 1317: 1318: 1319: 1320: 1321: 1322: 1323: 1324: 1325: 1326: 1327: 1328: 1329: 1330: 1331: 1332: 1333: 1334: 1335: 1336: 1337: 1338: 1339: 1340: 1341: 1342: 1343: 1344: 1345: 1346: 1347: 1348: 1349: 1350: 1351: 1352: 1353: 1354: 1355: 1356: 1357: 1358: 1359: 1360: 1361: 1362: 1363: 1364: 1365: 1366: 1367: 1368: 1369: 1370: 1371: 1372: 1373: 1374: 1375: 1376: 1377: 1378: 1379: 1380: 1381: 1382: 1383: 1384: 1385: 1386: 1387: 1388: 1389: 1390: 1391: 1392: 1393: 1394: 1395: 1396: 1397: 1398: 1399: 1400: 1401: 1402: 1403: 1404: 1405: 1406: 1407: 1408: 1409: 1410: 1411: 1412: 1413: 1414: 1415: 1416: 1417: 1418: 1419: 1420: 1421: 1422: 1423: 1424: 1425: 1426: 1427: 1428: 1429: 1430: 1431: 1432: 1433: 1434: 1435: 1436: 1437: 1438: 1439: 1440: 1441: 1442: 1443: 1444: 1445: 1446: 1447: 1448: 1449: 1450: 1451: 1452: 1453: 1454: 1455: 1456: 1457: 1458: 1459: 1460: 1461: 1462: 1463: 1464: 1465: 1466: 1467: 1468: 1469: 1470: 1471: 1472: 1473: 1474: 1475: 1476: 1477: 1478: 1479: 1480: 1481: 1482: 1483: 1484: 1485: 1486: 1487: 1488: 1489: 1490: 1491: 1492: 1493: 1494: 1495: 1496: 1497: 1498: 1499: 1500: 1501: 1502: 1503: 1504: 1505: 1506: 1507: 1508: 1509: 1510: 1511: 1512: 1513: 1514: 1515: 1516: 1517: 1518: 1519: 1520: 1521: 1522: 1523: 1524: 1525: 1526: 1527: 1528: 1529: 1530: 1531: 1532: 1533: 1534: 1535: 1536: 1537: 1538: 1539: 1540: 1541: 1542: 1543: 1544: 1545: 1546: 1547: 1548: 1549: 1550: 1551: 1552: 1553: 1554: 1555: 1556: 1557: 1558: 1559: 1560: 1561: 1562: 1563: 1564: 1565: 1566: 1567: 1568: 1569: 1570: 1571: 1572: 1573: 1574: 1575: 1576: 1577: 1578: 1579: 1580: 1581: 1582: 1583: 1584: 1585: 1586: 1587: 1588: 1589: 1590: 1591: 1592: 1593: 1594: 1595: 1596: 1597: 1598: 1599: 1600: 1601: 1602: 1603: 1604: 1605: 1606: 1607: 1608: 1609: 1610: 1611: 1612: 1613: 1614: 1615: 1616: 1617: 1618: 1619: 1620: 1621: 1622: 1623: 1624: 1625: 1626: 1627: 1628: 1629: 1630: 1631: 1632: 1633: 1634: 1635: 1636: 1637: 1638: 1639: 1640: 1641: 1642: 1643: 1644: 1645: 1646: 1647: 1648: 1649: 1650: 1651: 1652: 1653: 1654: 1655: 1656: 1657: 1658: 1659: 1660: 1661: 1662: 1663: 1664: 1665: 1666: 1667: 1668: 1669: 1670: 1671: 1672: 1673: 1674: 1675: 1676: 1677: 1678: 1679: 1680: 1681: 1682: 1683: 1684: 1685: 1686: 1687: 1688: 1689: 1690: 1691: 1692: 1693: 1694: 1695: 1696: 1697: 1698: 1699: 1700: 1701: 1702: 1703: 1704: 1705: 1706: 1707: 1708: 1709: 1710: 1711: 1712: 1713: 1714: 1715: 1716: 1717: 1718: 1719: 1720: 1721: 1722: 1723: 1724: 1725: 1726: 1727: 1728: 1729: 1730: 1731: 1732: 1733: 1734: 1735: 1736: 1737: 1738: 1739: 1740: 1741: 1742: 1743: 1744: 1745: 1746: 1747: 1748: 1749: 1750: 1751: 1752: 1753: 1754: 1755: 1756: 1757: 1758: 1759: 1760: 1761: 1762: 1763: 1764: 1765: 1766: 1767: 1768: 1769: 1770: 1771: 1772: 1773: 1774: 1775: 1776: 1777: 1778: 1779: 1780: 1781: 1782: 1783: 1784: 1785: 1786: 1787: 1788: 1789: 1790: 1791: 1792: 1793: 1794: 1795: 1796: 1797: 1798: 1799: 1800: 1801: 1802: 1803: 1804: 1805: 1806: 1807: 1808: 1809: 1810: 1811: 1812: 1813: 1814: 1815: 1816: 1817: 1818: 1819: 1820: 1821: 1822: 1823: 1824: 1825: 1826: 1827: 1828: 1829: 1830: 1831: 1832: 1833: 1834: 1835: 1836: 1837: 1838: 1839: 1840: 1841: 1842: 1843: 1844: 1845: 1846: 1847: 1848: 1849: 1850: 1851: 1852: 1853: 1854: 1855: 1856: 1857: 1858: 1859: 1860: 1861: 1862: 1863: 1864: 1865: 1866: 1867: 1868: 1869: 1870: 1871: 1872: 1873: 1874: 1875: 1876: 1877: 1878: 1879: 1880: 1881: 1882: 1883: 1884: 1885: 1886: 1887: 1888: 1889: 1890: 1891: 1892: 1893: 1894: 1895: 1896: 1897: 1898: 1899: 1900: 1901: 1902: 1903: 1904: 1905: 1906: 1907: 1908: 1909: 1910: 1911: 1912: 1913: 1914: 1915: 1916: 1917: 1918: 1919: 1920: 1921: 1922: 1923: 1924: 1925: 1926: 1927: 1928: 1929: 1930: 1931: 1932: 1933: 1934: 1935: 1936: 1937: 1938: 1939: 1940: 1941: 1942: 1943: 1944: 1945: 1946: 1947: 1948: 1949: 1950: 1951: 1952: 1953: 1954: 1955: 1956: 1957: 1958: 1959: 1960: 1961: 1962: 1963: 1964: 1965: 1966: 1967: 1968: 1969: 1970: 1971: 1972: 1973: 1974: 1975: 1976: 1977: 1978: 1979: 1980: 1981: 1982: 1983: 1984: 1985: 1986: 1987: 1988: 1989: 1990: 1991: 1992: 1993: 1994: 1995: 1996: 1997: 1998: 1999: 2000: 2001: 2002: 2003: 2004: 2005: 2006: 2007: 2008: 2009: 2010: 2011: 2012: 2013: 2014: 2015: 2016: 2017: 2018: 2019: 2020: 2021: 2022: 2023: 2024: 2025: 2026: 2027: 2028: 2029: 2030: 2031: 2032: 2033: 2034: 2035: 2036: 2037: 2038: 2039: 2040: 2041: 2042: 2043: 2044: 2045: 2046: 2047: 2048: 2049: 2050: 2051: 2052: 2053: 2054: 2055: 2056: 2057: 2058: 2059: 2060: 2061: 2062: 2063: 2064: 2065: 2066: 2067: 2068: 2069: 2070: 2071: 2072: 2073: 2074: 2075: 2076: 2077: 2078: 2079: 2080: 2081: 2082: 2083: 2084: 2085: 2086: 2087: 2088: 2089: 2090: 2091: 2092: 2093: 2094: 2095: 2096: 2097: 2098: 2099: 2100: 2101: 2102: 2103: 2104: 2105: 2106: 2107: 2108: 2109: 2110: 2111: 2112: 2113: 2114: 2115: 2116: 2117: 2118: 2119: 2120: 2121: 2122: 2123: 2124: 2125: 2126: 2127: 2128: 2129: 2130: 2131: 2132: 2133: 2134: 2135: 2136: 2137: 2138: 2139: 2140: 2141: 2142: 2143: 2144: 2145: 2146: 2147: 2148: 2149: 2150: 2151: 2152: 2153: 2154: 2155: 2156: 2157: 2158: 2159: 2160: 2161: 2162: 2163: 2164: 2

very next Sentence notoriously *Exposed your Own Nakedness*, by introducing the mention of *Achilles* after so absurd and ridiculous a manner. May I ask, how oft you have used this *Fine Expression* in your Discourses to your Hearers, telling them, that they ought to Glory in Christ's Example *as their Achilles*? How oft soever you have used it, doubtless it could not but carry along with it a Great Deal of *Edification*; and it may very well serve for a *Shrewd Hint*, How justly you Deserve the Title of an *Edifying Preacher*. May not One be induced hereby to imagine, that, notwithstanding the Out-cry you make against *Papish Unscriptural Saints*, there are also some *Puritan Unscriptural Saints*, among whom this same *Achilles* is esteemed by you as Chief, or rather more than a Saint, or Christ himself? For surely in your Comparison *Achilles* has plainly the Pre-eminence given him even before our *Blessed Saviour*, and is represented as a *more Extraordinary Person*. What a Strange Surprize then must it be to such of your Followers as have heard you use this Expression, to be Undeceived and told that this same *Achilles* (if not a *Puritan Saint* commonly unknown, but That spoken of in common Authors) was no other than a *Pagan or Heathen Hero or Great Warriour*; and consequently that this your Expression may be Justly Censured as being in some sort *Irreligious and Prophane*!

In short, the chief Reason I can think of for your thus pulling in (as it were by the Head and Shoulders) the *Pagan or Heathen Achilles*, is this, that you had a mind to show, how much more *Learned* you are than such a *Minister and Doctor of the Church* as my self; and that you are extremely well Read in *Homer* and other *Greek Authors*. But I must beg leave to observe, that had you been pleased to have contrived some occasion for introducing the mention of the *Greek Word or Name* writ in its proper or *Greek Letters*, it would have been somewhat *Better Hint* of your *Vast Skill in the Greek Tongue*.

Thus much for the *Manner* of your Expression; let us now consider what you *Aim at* thereby; and the *Meaning* thereof, as well as I can guess, must be in *Plain English*

glish to this Effect, viz. that *I seem to Glory in Christ's example of Prayer in his Agony, as a main Argument to justify Forms in that Duty.* Sir, you need not have said, that *I seem to Glory*, for I am not Ashamed readily to Own, that I do Actually *Glory in Christ's Example*, and that *because it is Christ's Example*, and so the *Greatest* that a True Christian can *Glory in*, and of the *Greatest Authority* to justify *Forms of Prayer.*

You say indeed that there is really Nothing that makes more *Against Forms* than *Christ's Prayer in his Agony.* But then you are pleased only to say so, and immediately to subjoin (to save me the Labour) a very good Proof of the Falseness of what you had said just afore. For (add you,) it is *Evident* Christ prayed then according to the *Present Occasion* and may not I as truly add, that so likewise *Our Forms of Prayer* are *Suitable or According to the Present Occasion* when they are used? You farther add, that Christ then prayed according to the *Exercise of his Spirit.* Now I have observed (p. 19, 20. of my Letter to a Dissenting Parishioner) that by this and the like Expressions Can be meant but One of these two things, either *Making a New Prayer by the Assistance of the Spirit*, or *Saying a Prayer already made with Spiritual Devotion.* In the former sense our Saviour could then pray but only the first time; the two other times He cannot possibly be said to pray according to the *Exercise of his Spirit* any other ways than in the latter sense of the Words or as it denotes to pray or repeat a prayer with the *Spirit of Devotion.* In like manner our *Common Prayer* may (considering the Great Piety of the Compilers of It, and with what Due Preparation they set about the Work, by Earnestly Praying God for his Special Assistance therein) justly be esteemed as *First Drawn up or Made by the Assistance of the Spirit*; and whosoever *Rightly uses* it ever since, may be truly said to *Pray according to the Exercise of his Spirit of Spiritual Devotion.* And thus you may see if you do not shut close your eyes, that even according to your Own Account there is an Excellent Agreement between *Christ's Prayer in his Agony* and our *Forms of Prayer.*

But (go you on) No Stinted Forms can reach All Occasions

that may happen. Sir, I have had (perhaps you may call it) the Misfortune to be so much used (by that Sort of Study which I take a peculiar Delight in) to Connexion, that I cannot get over this same little Particle [But] without considering how it comes in here, which is thus: say you, *Nothing really makes more against Forms than Christ's Prayer in his Agony*; then for proof hereof you add, *For Christ then prayed according to the Present Occasion, But no stinted Forms can reach All Occasions, Therefore* (— What? will it follow that) *No stinted Form can be According to the Present Occasion*: This surely will never follow by Any Rules of Logick or Right Reasoning. Pray then, Sir, give me leave now to give you a Kind Admonition, viz. that How much soever you may think fit to *Despise Logick in your Discourses to your Hearers*; yet whenever you *Write to Others*, or think fit to *Appear in Print*, you would be pleased to have more Regard to the Rules (tho' they be likewise stinted Forms) of *Syllogism*. By these you might have perceived that a *Stinted Form*, tho' it may not reach *All Occasions*, yet it may be very well used *According to a Present Occasion*. Nay, you might have perceived, that what you say in this respect *Against Stinted Forms*, holds as much *Against our Saviour's Prayer in his Agony*: for tho' it was then according to the *Present Occasion*, yet surely you will own that It will *Not Reach All Occasions*. Nay, this your Objection makes as much *against Extempore Prayer as stinted Forms*: for surely you will Allow that even the same *Extempore Prayer will Not Reach All Occasions*; otherwise why do you make *New Prayers* so very Often? And therefore pray see into what strange Difficulties you run your self; For 1st. you require to a *Good Prayer Two Qualities*, which are utterly *Inconsistent* the One with the other, viz. To be *Peculiar to One Present Occasion*, and yet *Reach All Occasions*.

2. You make the Addition of a *Few New Occasional Prayers* twice or thrice in the whole year to be a token of great Imperfection in *Our Forms*; and yet Cry up *Newness* of Prayer used every time you Meet as a token of the *Greatest* Imperfection in your *Extempore Prayer*. And now can Men be

guilty of *Greater Contradictions* than you and your Party are in this Case? Or can there be a clearer Evidence of you and your Party being quite *Blinded* with *Prejudice* and *Partiality*, than your not being Able to *Discern* your so *Apparent Self-Contradiction*?

And yet your *Own Blindness* in this Case will appear still more by what follows in your Letter. For tho' you say indeed, that *Christ's using the same words the three several times &c. makes Nothing for Us*, yet you are again unwittingly so very *Complaisant* as to *Prove the Contrary* by adding, that *this may be, and oft is used in Extempore Prayer, expressing the Desire by the Same Words, when there is Occasion to Pray oft for the same Mercy*. For herein you imply as Good an Argument as can be Desired for *Forms*, which stands thus: "When there is Occasion to Pray for the same Mercies, the Desire may be express'd by the same Words: But there is Occasion to Pray Daily for the same (viz. Common) Mercies: Therefore the Desire may be express'd Daily by the same Words". This, Sir, is no other in effect than your *Own Argument*, and 'tis indeed an *Unanswerable One* namely *Not Against*, but *For the Use of Forms*; forasmuch as to *Express the Desire Daily by the same Words*, is the same as to *Use Daily the same Form of Prayer*.

Nay, this your Argument will Prove not only the *Lawfulness* of *Forms* in general, but also the *Lawfulness* of *Repeating some Parts of Them several Times*, and so affords a very *Good Answer* to that *Weak Objection* made by some of your *Writers Against the Repetition of the Lord's Prayer &c. in our Liturgy*.

By this time you begin (I suppose) to Perceive, *whether* you are Got, and how the Stream of Truth has been so strong as to have forced you without your own Will *On our Side*, and to write *For Stinted Forms*, even when you designed to write *Against* them. It concerns you to take care and clear your self among your *Brethren*, least they begin to suspect that, tho' you pretend *Outwardly* that you have met with no *Conviction* in my Papers, yet you are *Inwardly Convinced* so far, as to pretend to write a *Defence of their Cause* only, that you might the *Better*

it, and Expose or Lay Open the Weakness and Badness of it.

As to what follows in your Letter, concerning *Arguing* *several* *Forms of Sermons* from *Christ's Repeating the same Expressions in his Doctrine &c.* it is so very Extravagant, as that serves only to Argue that you are not very Good at *Argumentation*; since there is by no means a just Parallel between the Instance I make use of for *Forms of Prayer*, and Instances mentioned by you for *Forms of Sermons*. Nay, your way of *Arguing* holds good, you may run your self where you are aware into another Noose or Snare, and prove you your self Preach by *Form*, if so be you keep to the Method of *Doctrine, Division, Use &c.* But perhaps you are Averse to *Forms*, that you take particular Care, that your *Discourses* should be Far enough from having Any thing of *Form or Use, or Any Method* at all.

But tho' what you alledge, is no Good Argument for *Forms of Sermons*; yet I assure you, I am by no means against them; but on the contrary have a very great Opinion of them, as well as of *Forms of Prayer*. For I think might be of Great Benefit, and Prevent a Great Deal of Evil, was there a Book of *Sermons* drawn up by Judicious Persons on *All Subjects fit for Common Auditories*, and *All Ministers or Teachers Obligated to Use them*, unless on some special Occasions. And to such an *Injunction* I should willingly submit, and so testify that I am not so Conceited of my Performances, as Another may be, who thinks me so, would be apt to refuse such a Submission, whether out of Humility let others judge.

Thus have I largely shewn the Great Weakness of your Objections against my Arguments for *Forms* drawn from our Saviour's Prayer in his Agony. You go on next to your Objections against my Arguments for *Forms*, drawn from the Lord's Prayer; and I shall attend you, and give them their due Consideration.

Mr. DOWLEY's Letter.

You likewise insist much on the Lord's prayer given to the Disciples, thinking you have thereby convincing proof for forms, &c.

whereas for ought you have said on that head, that may be taken as a directory than a forme, the different relation of the 2. Evangelists may signifie so much, and the Apostles Etice may confirm those thoughts, of whom we never read scripture that they used it in the set words, but suited their expressions in prayer to their severall occasions, as the spirit gave utterance, as may be seen. Acts 1: 24: 25: Chapt 4: 24: to 30th. and more-over the subject matter of that prayer will be this sense, for if it be enjoind to all that profess the name of Christ to use in the set words, then multitudes are commanded to speake falsely, to call god in heaven their father, when they are of their father the Diuel in hell, as Christ told the Pharisees notwithstanding their profession and claim of god as their father. John 8, and I wonder how men of violent spirits can say prayer, begging for forgiveness as they forgive others, when indeed they are full of rage and fury, and far from any giving temper;

Dr. WELLS's Answer.

Instead of barely affirming, that the Lord's Prayer may rather be taken as a Directory than a Pattern, for ought I have said on that head; you should have some way or other disproved the Reasons I have alledged to that purpose; particularly you should have disproved, that those words of our Saviour, When ye pray, Say, Our Father &c. do come to the very Same as if he had said, When ye pray say in this Form, Our Father &c. And if when our Saviour thus plainly intimates, that it is a Form, you will nevertheless boldly gainsay it. I cannot expect that you should have due regard to Any thing I can offer, when you refuse to have due regard to what our Saviour himself has said.

The Different relations given by the two Evangelists are far from Disproving the Lord's Prayer to be a Form, that they mightily Confirm it; forasmuch as they prove, that the Prayer was prescribed by our Saviour at two different places and so at two different times. If by the different relation of you refer to that Little Difference of Expression which is to be found in the two Evangelists, you might have perceived that this can be no material Objection, had you but con-

that our Saviour did not deliver his Prayer in the Tongue, and that the different Translation of a Form out of one tongue into Another cannot possibly prove it to be a Form. And as to the Omission of the *Doxology* in the *Liturgy*, that can only Prove, that the said *Doxology* (as being Properly a part of the Prayer) may be omitted or by our Saviour's own permission; and agreeably hereunto you may see in our *Liturgy*, that the Lord's Prayer is appointed to be repeated sometimes with, sometimes without the *Doxology*. In short, if such a Difference of Expression, or such an Omission as is above specified, will not what was designed to be a Form to become No Form, you must allow also Our Common Prayer to be No Form, since there are several Parts of It to be sometimes omitted, and at other times Inserted, and since it is but a Most Mighty instead of Almighty or the like, and is not to be a Form. And if so, then you are to Invent pretended Reasons to Excuse your self from Not Coming with It; since your Objection against it as a Form no longer hold, if this last Objection holds Good. Thus by the way you may further see the Badness of your Cause, when the Objections, which you are forced to make up with, Destroy One the Other.

I could add a great deal more still for the further confirmation of this matter, which you might have found in the Writings upon this Subject, and so seen your self fully Answered herein afore you wrote. Neither will I barely Say this, but refer you to some particular Treatises, viz. *Certain Cases of Conscience resolved concerning the Lawfulness of Joyning with the Lord's Prayer*, Part. 2. Cas. 5. in Vol. 2d. of *London-Discourses*: or else in the *Abridgment of them* Ch. 3. or in *Whitby's Annotations* on Matth. 6. 9. &c.

In the forecited Places of each of the said Books you may likewise have seen your self fully Answered afore you wrote, as to what comes next in your Letter, viz. that the *Apostles Practice* may (you dare not speak out to great an Extent, as to say, the *Apostles Practice* doth) confirm the Union of the Lord's Prayer being only a Directory, forasmuch as we never read in Scripture that they used It in set words,

words, but suited their expressions in prayer to their several occasions, as the spirit gave them utterance. For in the forementioned Books you would have been taught, that what John saith of Christ, viz. that there were many things which Jesus did, which were not written, holds true also of the Apostles: and that you may as well conclude from the silence of the Scripture, that the Apostles did not Baptize in the name of the Father &c. that they never prayed before Christ's resurrection, that many of them never preached the Gospel &c. that they never used the Lord's Prayer. And as to the want of Utterance you might have learnt from the Books above mentioned, that "it was Miraculous and Particular to the Primitive Age; that you may as well pretend to the want of Tongues, as that of Utterance; and that if your Prayers are thus Inspired as those of the Apostles were, they may be of Equal Authority with the Scripture; which even the Sober Dissenters themselves will not maintain, but disavow."

I confess that I cannot refer you to the forementioned or any other Books for an Answer to your next Objection (methinks you begin to Think highly of It hereupon, when there is no such Occasion, this happening) Not because It is so Good as to be Unanswerable, but because It is so Bad and Extravagantly Absurd, as that I know of no One of your own Party so very Weak as to Make Use of It but your self; and now you have brought It forth, it is really not Worth an Answer. However in Civility to you I will not pass it by wholly Unregarded; but shall put you in mind, that you would have done well to have Considered that supposing the Lord's Prayer to have been enjoyed (as it is by All that profess the name of Christ, but) only to be used by Christians to use in the set Words, yet this had been abundantly enough to have proved the said Prayer to have been designed for a Form; inasmuch as a Form that is used but by Ten, is as much a Form as if it was used by Ten Thousand. Again you would have done well to have Considered, that this same Objection of yours, if it holds Good, makes it Unwarrantable for Multitudes of Christians to say not only the Lord's Prayer, but Any Other Prayer. Once more you would have done well to have Considered

ed, that this your Objection carries in it a most se-
Reflexion on a Certain Dissenting Teacher and his most
Followers. For say you, No one is commanded to say
Lord's Prayer, that is a Child, not of God, but of the
Now 'Tis notoriously known, that a Certain Dis-
Teacher and his most Zealous Followers never say the
Prayer. Therefore is it not a Natural Consequence,
the said Certain Dissenting Teacher and his Followers
themselves to be Children, not of God, but of the De-
In like manner say you, No One is Commanded to
the Lord's Prayer, that is full of Rage and Fury, and
from a Forgiving Temper. To which may be subjoyned,
ertain Dissenting Teacher &c. never says the Lord's Prayer;
therefore may it not be naturally inferred, that the said
enting Teacher &c. is Full of Rage and Fury, and Far
a Forgiving Temper? Now if Any One will cast such
Reflexions on himself &c. who shall Help it, or
whom can he be Angry in justice, but only with
self, for Not acting more Discreetly and Uprightly?
Well, but you have Still in reserve Another Objection
ant Forms, supposing those already drawn from the
Prayer will not Hold; which is as follows.

Mr. DOWLEY's Letter.

ut suppose it as you say that it was given by Christ as a
form, what is that to other devised ones, because Christ the
of the Church and lawgiver might give his disciples a set
form, it doth not therefore follow that the servants may do
so, if there were no further imposition then what christ hath
you would have no quarrell with the dissenters; so that
all your arguing from scripture there doth not appear there
warrant for formes, and therefore those that say so are not
teachers but ministers of truth, and those that say the con-
may more easily be laid under that denomination.

Dr. WELLS's Answer.

You needed not, Sir, to have given your self the
trouble of making the Objection contained in this last pa-
graph, nor we the trouble of Answering it, since you
might

might also have seen this fully Answered afore you wrote, you consulted the forecited places of the two first Books above mentioned; or had you been but pleased to duly Considered the first head of my First Letter. For you might thence have learnt, that what Christ thought good to prescribe to his Church for its benefit, the Same is like without all doubt may be prescribed by Such of his Servants, as He has entrusted the Government of his Church with. And also you might have learnt, that All Impositions, which Such his Servants think fit to make in things not Forbidden, are to be look'd upon and obey'd as Christ's own Impositions, and therefore that the Dissenters have just reason to Quarrel with us.

I cannot well conceive, why you should give me any particular intimation of the Shortness of the Lord's Prayer, unless you design it by way of Hint, that our Sermon is too long. But then this Hint will serve also for an Hint of your Self-Contradiction, whilst you blame our Common Prayer on that very Same account, whereby you endeavour to Recommend, and for which your Party are wont to set up, your Extempore Prayers, namely for the Length of the Prayer. As for what follows in your last paragraph, it is only a Hint, that you (as well as some of your Followers) are Resolved that, let me Write or Say what I will, never so clear or so clear Truth, yet you will have no Regard to it. I shall therefore only add, that if you will but have a Regard (tho' not to Me, yet) to Some of the most eminent of your Own Writers, and to the Universal Judgment of All the Reformed Churches beyond the Seas, you must acknowledge (as will appear in my next Treatise) that there is in Scripture sufficient warrant for Forms, and therefore those that say there doth not appear such warrant, are justly chargeable with being False Teachers on that account.

Thus much for what you say by way of Objection Against my Argument to justify Forms of Prayer: you go on next to say Something in defence of Extempore Prayer.

MR. DOWLEY'S Letter.

Before you declaim so loudly against extempore prayer

With Dr. Wells's Answer.

31

do well to clear your-self of those scriptures that plainly
it forth as Rom: 8: 26: 27: where the Apostle sets forth the
helping our infirmitys in the matter as well as in the manner
of duty, which would be altogether needless if we be tied to
come before our eyes, where the matter is limited & known be-
fore, and, & he also saith the spirit so works sometimes in the chil-
dren of god in that duty, as that it cannot be uttered, but its
utter a forme that is before us; & before you so wholly run
in this way of praying you would do well to answer bishop
Burns upon that subje^t, who p. 12: saith, that to despise it,
those reproachfull expressions about it, is for the most part a
mark of a prophane heart, & of persons being strangers to the
comfort of the duty; And also you should be agreed
in your selves of its sinfullness, for many of your own com-
mon practise it, & your arguing will make them as much
teachers as us.

Dr. WELLS's Answer.

Would you, Sir, but have given your self leave duely to
considered what I say in my Letters concerning Ex-
tempore Prayer, you would have perceived that All this last
paragraph of your Letter is *Nothing at all* to the purpose.
For first, All that is said in my Letter relates to *Extempore*
Prayer in Publick: and I leave Any one of Common Capa-
city to judge, whether Rom. 8. 26, 27. can possibly be under-
stood of Publick Extempore Prayer. For as the Apostle saith
in the former part of the verse, that the Spirit helpeth our
infirmities, so in the latter part he tells us how it doth
viz. by interceding for Us with Groanings that Cannot be
uttered. But now can such Groanings as Cannot be Uttered
be applied to the Matter of Publick Extempore Prayers which
are actually Uttered, without the plainest Absurdity and
contradiction?

And indeed you are (after your wonted manner) so
as in the next Sentence to Disprove your self by say-
ing the very Same in effect as I have just now said. For say-
ing the Spirit so works sometimes in the Children of God in
that Duty (viz. of Prayer) as that it cannot be Uttered,
since you infer, that this cannot be understood of Forms

of

of Prayer, because it is *Easy* to utter a *Form* that is *Us*. In like manner I argue, that the *Spirit's* working in *Prayer* is so as that it cannot be uttered, Cannot possibly be understood of the *Matter* of your *Extempore Prayer*, forasmuch as you *Actually Utter* that in your *Congregations*. And thus you have your self *Disproved* the *Texts* alledged by you to *Justify* your *Extempore Prayer*, and so have saved me the labour of *Refuting* my self of them, and have brought on your self the *Charge* of *Clearing* your self of a *New Contradiction*.

Besides, had you not as little *Regard* to *Logick* as to *Prayer*, you might know, that tho' in *Some Particular Cases* (as the time of *Distress* or *Sufferings*, to which the *Apoc.* particularly refers) we may not know what *Particularly* to *Pray* for as we ought; yet it doth not thence follow, but that we may know (at *All times*) what in *General* to *Pray* for as we ought, viz. *All things* that are requisite for *Our Souls* and *Bodies*, so far forth as *God* shall see *Expedient* for *Us*, that both the *Matter* and *Manner* of our *Common Prayer* be thus truly *Agreeable* to the *Will* of *God*, you may see from the *Exhortation* at the *Beginning*, and *St. Chrysostom's* *Prayer* at the *End*. And thus you may see, if you will, that neither *Rom. 8. 26, 27.* nor the other place of *Scripture* you refer to, can make *Any thing* *Against* our *Form of Prayer* For *Extempore Prayer* in *Publick*; and therefore there is no need I should *Clear* my self of them, or that you should *Mention* them being *nothing* to the *purpose*.

2. I call upon you, Sir, to shew in what part of my *Letters* I have *Declaimed* so loudly against *Extempore Prayer* wholly to run it down, or to use *Reproachfull Expressions* about it, or to say that *It is Sinfull in its self*. 'Till you do this (which I am sure you *Cannot*) there is no occasion for me to answer what *Bishop Wilkins* saith on that subject, since he saith *Nothing* against what I have said; nor need I reply to what you mention of *Some of Our Own Clergy* practising *Extempore Prayer* (for I suppose you mean) in *their Sermons*, because *Our Church* gives them *Liberty* to do so, if they think fit, after they have read the *Common Prayer* and therefore such their *Practice* is *Suitable* to the *Allowance* made by *Our Church*, and *not Contrary*, or in *Opposition* to

as your *Practice* is. Whence it clearly follows, that
Arguing will by no means make them False Teachers as
as you and other Dissenting Teachers.
 have now largely consider'd *All* you have said in
 Letter by way of *Objection* Against the Arguments
 the use of by me *For Forms* of Prayer; and shall leave
 Impartial Reader to judge, whether I have not proved
 several Particulars urged by you to be *Hints* (not of *Mine*,
 of your own *Nakedness*. And shall only observe here
 on this Head, that notwithstanding the Dislike
 pretend to *Forms*, yet I am apt to believe, that were
 Prayers and Sermons carefully taken in writing for one
 six-month, or but for *Six months*; it might appear, that
 your Prayers and Sermons are at the bottom no other
 Forms, somewhat chopt and changed several ways, (just
 One should begin sometime with one part, another
 with another part &c. of the *Common Prayer*) and
 you only *Delude* and *Put upon* Weak and Unthink-
 People by giving out, that you Pray *Extempore*. But
 whether you pray *Extempore* or *Not*, is no ways material,
 'tis evident, that if your *Praying* and *Preaching* be like
 your *Writing*, it is Far from being *By the Spirit*; and yet
 have you to find out a Reason, (if you can) why you
 should not pretend to *Write by the Spirit* as well as to *Pray*
by the Spirit, since the Apostles, who *Prayed* and
Preached by the Spirit, did also *Write by the same Spirit*.
 the next Head you think fit to take notice of, is that of
ordination, of which you speak thus:

Mr. DOWLEY's Letter.

cannot forbear further observing, how the power of Truth con-
 vincts you to yield the power of ordination to presbiters in Scripture
 and whatever other order under that name hath been set up
 divorced of that power, we have no concern with it, pro-
 viding ourselves to be of scripture institution & no other; though
 along the papal usurpation ordination as well as other things
 disordered, yet in the times of reformation things should be
 reduced to their primitive pattern, as well as other matters were in
 the reformed Churches, and even in yours the superiority of
 C bishops

bishops above presbiters was long after the reformation looked upon but as a humane constitution, as many bishops themselves have acknowledged, and the crying it up as *jure divino* is but of late standing.

Dr. WELLS's Answer.

Before I enter upon the Arguing part of your foregoing paragraph, I desire to know what you mean by the strange Word [*Presbiters.*] For I am not ashamed to own, that I do not remember that in my Reading, I ever met with it afore. I know indeed that some of the Clergy are called *Presbyters*, and that such is the True way of Writing the English Name, you might have learnt from my Letters, but you either so much as Read them, or had you not been resolved rather to Spell Falsely than to Agree with Me in the manner of Spelling the said Word. I believe, that your mighty Greek Hero or Champion Achilles will be able to justify your skill in the Greek Language so far as to Free it from being much called in question on this account of your Spelling the aforesaid word, not with due Attention to the Original Greek Word. Had the word occurred in your Letter but once so writ, I had took no notice of it but had ascribed it to mere Inadvertency; but when it stands there so writ no less than three or four times, 'tis evident that it must proceed from Another Cause. But after this I will do you this piece of Justice to Acquaint the World that (since I received your Letter) I have been informed by an Honest Lay-man, (which I particularly mention to prevent your having Hard Thoughts of Any Clergy-man) that it appears from your Letter to Me, that you are within some late years very much Come off from that Rigid Conformity you formerly shewed to the Received Way of Spelling. And therefore since you have been thus Brought in Some Tolerable measure to Orthography, I will not quite Despair, but that you may in time be Brought likewise to Orthodoxy. Thus much then for the Falseness of your Spelling, next for the Falseness (not of your Argument for you have, I acknowledge, avoided that, by contenting your self only with Bare Assertions; and therefore I

proceed to shew the *Falseness* but) of *What you Assert or Say*,
that part of your Letter we are now upon.

You say then that *I yield the Power of Ordination to Presby-*
ters in Scripture-times; which (in the Sense you understand the
words in) is apparently *False*, as may be seen more especially
32. of my Letter to you, where I prove that the *Power of*
Ordination did not belong to Presbyters properly so called in the
New Testament, and therefore did not belong to such *Presby-*
ters as your Ordination was Derived from; and with whom there-
fore you are altogether Concerned, how vainly soever you pro-
claim your self to be of *Scripture-Institution*. 'Tis true indeed,
that you have no Concern with any other Order set up since the
Scripture-times under the Name of Presbyters, and *Divested of*
Power of Ordination, because there never was *Any such*
Order, nor not so much as mentioned (as I know of) by
any One but your self: and your Mention of It plainly
shews that you are to Learn the great Difference between
being *Divested* and *Not Invested*.

As to the *Irregularities* which had crept into *Ordination*
during the *Papal Usurpation*, they were removed at the *Re-*
formation in our Church; and *All things were Restored to their*
Primitive pattern more exactly in our Church than in Other Re-
formed Churches, as in other Instances, so particularly be-
cause *We retained the Distinction of the Three Ministerial Or-*
ders in agreement to the Primitive Pattern.

Whereas you say that the *Crying up of the Superiority of*
Bishops to Presbyters as jure Divino is but of late Standing,
and do only betray thereby your Want of Knowledge in
Ecclesiastical Affairs. For a Right Knowledge in these would
have convinced you, that the aforesaid Doctrine is no
other than the Received Doctrine of the *Primitive Church*,
and that such as did *Oppose* it in the more *Early times* were
always *Censured and Condemned* by the *General Consent of the*
ancient Councils. And in like manner ever since the *Re-*
formation such as have gone about to Call the said Do-
ctrine in Question, or Pretend the aforesaid Superiority to
be only of *Humane Institution*, have always been looked
upon in our Church as *Heterodox and Unsound*. And if you
really know of *Many Bishops* that have acknowledged the *E-*

piscopal Superiority to Presbyters to be of no other than Human Institution, you would have done some Kindness in giving their Particular Names, that Others may know them too; if you do not truly know Many, you ought not to have made so very Free with that High Sacred Order, as to Cast such a Slur upon It. But be what you say as it will out of my Profound and Bounden Reverence to that Apostolical Order I shall only Add, that I leave you or Any Other (whosoever) to Disprove, what I have said concerning the Apostolical Constitution of Episcopacy as received in the Church of England, in p. 33, &c. of my Letter to your self: and all that supposing (after all) Our Episcopacy to be only of Humane Constitution, yet you are bound in Conscience to Comply with It and Obey your Bishop, as may be gathered from what I have proved in my First Head of my First Letter and may be seen more particularly and largely proved by Mr. Bennet in his Discourse of Schism ch. 9. and lastly may be plainly and fairly inferred from the Practice even of such Bishops as you mention. For though These Bishops may or might think their Superiority over Presbyters to be of Humane Constitution, yet they must in Charity be supposed to think it notwithstanding to be a Lawfull Constitution and Not Disagreeable to the Rule of Scripture, or else they would (Agree with you in other respects as well as this, and) stand Self-Condemned, namely by exercising a Power which they judged unlawful.

Well, but if All you have hitherto Alledged, be it proved to make nothing Against what I have said Concerning the Invalidity of your Presbyterian Ordination; yet you think there remains still Three Rocks in my way, and must unavoidably run upon All three. But I doubt not but I shall meet with Better Success, and so shall venture on with good Heart and Courage.

MR. DOWLEY'S LETTER.

Your arguing to overthrow our ordination runs you upon 3 rocks: to advance an uninterupted succession of ordination from Apostles to these times, which can never be made out, and

protesta

Protestants writing against the papists laugh at it, to defend it you must trace it through all the darknes of popery, where you will find many insuperable difficultys, you will find many schismes, many popes at a time severally ordaining bishops, and very hard to know which was the true, and whether your succession be from the true or not the schismaticall, & how you will clear it from not proceeding from pope Jone I leave to you to determine, your argument seems to inferre a certain verue dropping from the fingers of the ordainer on the ordained, which savours ranke of popery, tending to make orders a sacrament, which all protestants deny.

Dr. WELLS's Answer.

It is what the Church of England justly Glories in, that she is Able to Make out her Claim to an Uninterrupted Succession of Ordination from the Apostles to these times; and whosoever asserts the Contrary, only betrays his own Ignorance in Church-history. Though your Followers are so Weak in themselves, and so unreasonably Civil to you, yet you must not expect that Others will be so Put upon, that they will look for Good Proof of what you say, before they believe It. Whereas on the contrary you are not pleased to give One Single Positive Proof that the aforesaid Succession hath been ever Interrupted, but content your self Barely to Assert with Great Confidence and as great Untruth, that Such a Succession can never be made out, and that All the Protestants writing against the Papists laugh at it. Pray consider whether you do not deserve to be laughed at your self for an Assertion so Groundless and manifestly False. Surely the Episcopal Protestants make up a very Considerable Part of the Protestants, and Any one that your self would think in reason, that These do not laugh at the Papists for what they themselves maintain and hold to be True.

As for what you Hint concerning the Darknes of Popery, the Plurality of Popes at the same time, and a Pope Jone, they are All of them so many more Hints of your Want of Knowledge in Church-Affairs. For in the Darkest time of Popery there is Great Light as to the Point of Ordination,

and your Thinking *Otherwise* is only an Evidence of being Extremely in the *Dark*, as to the true State of *Age*, which is commonly called the *Dark Age*; and the true Reason of It's being so Called.

And the *Plurality of Popes at the same time* doth not in least Prejudice the *Succession of Ordination*; and your thinking *Otherwise* is only a Proof of your not Knowing, the same Person, which is not a *Rightfull Pope*, yet be a *Rightfull Bishop*; and consequently may have a *Right* to exercise the *Power of Ordination*, though may not have a *just Right* to exercise the *Papal Authority* received in the *Church of Rome*. And this Consideration being of *Universal Extent*, I purposely pass by Others which might be urged in reference to our Church in particular.

However, I cannot but observe from hence that I have unawares let drop from your Pen what is sufficient to prove your self to be a *Schismatical Teacher*. whereas you say, that in the *Darkness of Popery* we shall *Many Schisms, many Popes at the same time*, and that 'tis to *Know, which was the True, and which the Schismatical*; plainly acknowledge, that there may be a *Schism*, where there is a *perfect Agreement* not only in *Fundamentals*, but also in *Rites and Ceremonies*, if so be there is notwithstanding an *Opposition between the Members of the said Church*; and agree that whenever there were *many Popes at a time*, there could be but *One true or Rightfull Pope*, and the Others were to be esteem'd *Schismatical*. Whence it will follow much more that the *Dissenters* are guilty of *Schism*, because though they may *Agree with us in Fundamentals*, yet they openly Oppose the *Church of England* in other respects: and it will follow that Any one that sets himself up to be a Teacher in opposition to the *True and Rightfull Minister* of any Part he thereby becomes a *Schismatical Teacher*, namely (if for no other reason, yet for this alone, viz.) because He Opposes openly the *True and Rightfull Minister*.

Let the Reader now judge, whether you are not run upon a *Rock* so far, as miserably to *Shatter and Split* the Cause you are embarked in: and yet it will presently appear

have received still more Damage as to the Reputation
 of our own Scholarship. For whereas you leave me to clear
 the Succession of our Ordination from proceeding from Pope Jone,
 I am sure this is as far as any thing Can be, from Car-
 rying along with it an *Insurmountable Difficulty*. For though
 by no means love to be Foolishly Confident with-
 out grounds, yet I may venture to say, that 'twill prove
 an *Insurmountable Difficulty* for you make out, that there ever
 was a Pope Jone. Indeed I have read of a Pope Joan, and
 this be the same you mean, you have given a new
Authority, that you cannot yet quite shake off your Old Non-
 conformity to true Spelling. Had One of your poor Ignorant
 Clergy thus spelt his wife's name, it had been easily Ex-
 cusable; but for Mr. Dowley, that Great Scholar, that is
 much read in the Greek (or suppose only in the *English*).
 Testament, Not to Know how to Write the said Name
 conformably to the Word it is derived from, viz.
 Joanna, or at least, to the Received Way of Spelling It
 among the Learned, is not so easily to be Excused.
 Hitherto you have given (in this paragraph of your
 former) Hints of your Unacquaintedness with Church-History
 and True Spelling; but you give in the last place an Hint
 of what is much worse and more Discommendable, viz.)
 your Disingenuity. For I appeal to you your self, whe-
 ther you do not well know, that We of the Church of Eng-
 land as well as Other Protestants Deny Orders to be a Sacra-
 ment, and Condemn the contrary Opinion as a vain piece
 of Popery. And therefore Could you but have prevailed
 upon your self to Deal for once Ingenuously, you could not
 have suspected Any thing that I have said of the *Virtue*
 of Ordination to tend in the least towards the Popish Opinion;
 you would have understood It to import no more than
 that it is Allowed by All that Allow Ordination, viz. that
 the Imposition of Hands is the Scriptural way of Setting men apart
 to the Ministry; and that No Persons can Duely take upon
 themselves to exercise such Imposition of Hands, but Those that have
 the said Power or Authority Duely transmitted down to them
 from the Apostles, as have the Bishops of Our Church. But
 the foregoing Instance is not the only Instance of your

Disingenuity, as will appear from what comes next in your Letter.

MR. DOWLEY'S Letter.

2: your discourse drives you to set up an order of presbyters that the scripture is unacquainted with, viz, not having power of ordination, which you own scripture presbyters might have, and in so doing I shall leave it to you to consider, how you can clear yourself of that charge you lay against us; and how you can make yourself an officer of scripture appointment.

Dr. WELLS'S Answer.

Sir, either you must own that you did not carefully read over my Letter to you, or else you must be guilty of notorious *Disingenuity*, in misrepresenting what I say, so as you do in the foregoing paragraph. Have I not there expressly prov'd (p. 31, 32) that it is evident from 1 Tim. 4. 14. compared with 2 Tim. 1. 6. as also from Titus 1. 5. that the Presbytery or Presbyters there mentioned had not the Power of Ordination? and therefore is it any other than a downright Untruth for you to say, that I set up an Order of Presbyters that the Scripture is unacquainted with? Wherefore this same Assertion of yours being thus plainly False, All that you infer from it falls to the ground of it self; and my Charge against the Validity of your Orders still holds Good, and I my self appear from the Texts last cited to be an Officer of Scripture-appointment, tho' not invested with the Power of Ordination.

As to what you mention concerning my Owning that Scripture-Presbyters might have the Power of Ordination, would you have been so *Ingenuous* as to have Carefully Read and Considered, what I have said concerning the Promiscuous Use of the Word [Presbyter] in the Scripture-times, you could not but have perceived that what I say upon the forementioned Point, Cannot possibly make Any thing for you. And whenever you shall think fit to Undertake to Disprove what I have said on this head, paragraph by paragraph, as I have done here in reference to your Letter; then I persuade my self that you will find that what I have Allowed, makes Nothing False but Much Against you, and that you will meet with some Conviction inwardly, tho' you may think it proper to stifle it.

I have

I have I think clearly escaped *Running upon any Rock* herto; and of the *Three Rocks* you mentioned there remains now but *One* more to be escaped; and I assure my of the like Good success, and so proceed on.

Mr. DOWLEY's Letter.

you unchurch most if not all the reformed churches beyond sea, they have no other ordination then what is among the dissenters, and so we may see your charity to the protestant religion, that while you acknowledge the papal ministry you disown in the protestant churches abroad; I wish by the advancing this opinion you be not pulling down yourselves with your own hands, for nothing renders any party more hatefull to god & expressly than such monopolising true ministry and salvation among ourselves, this gave a good step towards the overthrow of Rome, would be the only church though wretchedly degenerate & mother of harlots, no salvation without conformity to her, no worship ministry nor ordinances but in her way, & this gave reason to those that loathed her abominations to depart out of & it may be admonition to others lest they stumble at that stumbling stone.

Dr. WELLS's Answer.

I can easily guess at your policy in placing this Rock, as being in your opinion the *Greatest* of the *Three*, and so Great, that tho' I might possibly Keep off from receiving any prejudice by the *Two* former, yet I could not Run foul upon This, and Ruine my Cause. But alas! poor man, you might have known (had you been pleas'd ever Consult our Writers) that this same Rock has been long quite Blown up, and so Levell'd as to be put out of any capacity of Hurting the Cause I am embarked in.

I very well know, that you and your Brethren do notuple Basely to Delude and Deceive poor Ignorant people in this matter, by telling them that the Protestants beyond are most (if not all) in an exact Agreement with your views as to manner of Ordination, Worship, &c. But tho' you make

make no Conscience thus to Beguile and Mislead Ignorant People, who know little (if any thing) more of the Transactions of the World than what lies within the narrow Compass of *Eight or Ten miles round them*, yet you should have been more Prudent than to think to Put upon Others after such a manner, Who are much Better Acquainted with the State of the Protestants beyond Sea than you seem to be by your Letter.

Twill I suppose be a great Surprize to your Followers to hear and have plainly proved and made out, (What is so directly Contrary to the Wrong Notions you have instilled into them, viz.) that *All the Protestants beyond Sea* do Approve of Our Rites and Ceremonies, and Episcopal Ordination &c. as *Very Lawfull*, and do Condemn your Separation from our Church as *Unwarrantable*, and yet this is no Other than what shall be made Good in my intended Treatise above-mentioned.

In the mean while 'twill be abundantly sufficient to observe in general, that your Case is very far different from the Case of the Protestant Churches beyond Sea as to the matter of Ordination; and therefore the Denying the Validity of your Ordination will not presently amount to a like Flat Denial of the Validity of their Ordination; neither do I go about presently to Un-church them, tho' what I have said concerning the Invalidity of your Ordination is Enough to Un-Church All the Dissenters in England.

And hence you may learn, that the Church of England is far from Monopolizing True Ministry and Salvation to Her self, or from saying That there is no True Worship but in her Way, &c. tho' She doth maintain that Schism or an Unnecessary Separation from her Communion by such as ought to Submit to Her Lawfull Injunctions, is a Damnable Sin; and Consequently that All the Dissenters in England that are Guilty of such Separation, are Guilty of a Damnable Sin; and as long as they Continue so, are Out of a State of Salvation. And this is so far from a Monopolizing of Salvation as the Scripture plainly warrants again and again; and therefore to Blame it, is to Blame the Scripture it self.

I shall only observe further, that had you consulted Mr. Bennet's Book of Schism from ch. 6. to ch. 11. inclusively, you might have seen what you say in this last paragraph, answered afore you wrote; and that what you say concerning the Church of Rome, hath no Relation to our Church, and therefore is altogether Impertinent: and lastly, that I am under no Apprehension of Our Church being Pulled down, So long as Authority is Able to Keep off your Party from laying Violent Hands upon Her. Let us then Proceed.

Mr. DOWLEY's Letter.

Our paraleling the dissenters with the Papists is most trifling, & as you exeeding open, it's very well known the dissenters are at a remotest distance from them, & they themselves say that a reconciliation with some might be, but with us impossible, this turne of yours brings to my mind what is reported of Billingsgate, where the greatest w-re shall be sure to cry w--re first; between Rome & some others it is evident many real & design'd paralels may be made in doctrine constitution discipline & worship, but all that you have raked up concerning the dissenters is only nominal & accidental; good is no less good though evil ones have counterfeited it to cover base designs, the pharisees made prayer a pretence to devour widows houses, yet is not prayer lesse a duty, & to be neglected & exploded thereupon, & so though Romane missionaries (supposing your relations to be true) have pretended to have the spirit in prayer while they were destitute of the spirit, & had wicked purposes in hand, yet is not praying in the Holy Ghost to be cast away, & all turned into forme, praying ex-tem-pore took not its rise from them, but is as old as the bible, and the learned Mr Clarkson hath sufficiently made out from antiquity, that there were no such thing as formes made use of in the church for some centurys after Christ; its very certain that the papists have turned themselves into all shapes to divide protestants, & to blast & blemish the reformation, & many more instances might be given of their intreagues among you than I can say, but we object not to you such trifles, but things more weighty & real.

It

Dr. WELLS's Answer.

It had been much Better for you, Sir, had you contented your self to make use of the plain common word [*comparing*] instead of that *Word of Art*, which you Falsely [*Paraleling*] For your Not Knowing how to write Word more Agreeable to it's Derivation (as appears more than One Instance in the foregoing paragraph of your Letter) is another Shrewd *Hint*, that *Greek* is the *Greek* to you, and that you are not endued with the *Greek Tongues*, tho' you vainly pretend to that of *Utterance*, which as they are Both joyned together in the very Text, where the Apostles are said to *speak* (namely, with other *Tongues*) the Spirit gave them *Utterance*. And therefore your reasoning above that the Apostles *prayed as the Spirit gave them Utterance* *Act. 1. 24, 25.* and *Act. 4. 24, to 30.* is in other in effect than *Two False Citations*; inasmuch as there is no mention made in either of the forecited places of their *Praying* then, as the Spirit gave them *Utterance*; you Boldly and Unwarrantably take part of a verse of one Chapter, and heedlessly apply it to parts of other Chapters.

Moreover you your self, Sir, do not Deny, but that the *Parallel* I have drawn (by way of *Specimen* of what might be more Largely done that way) between the *Protestants and Papists* holds True, and therefore if it be *Trifling*, it can become so only on account of the *Trifling* of the Instances wherein the said *Parallel* is drawn. And you think fit thus to Intimate, that *Praying and Preaching Without Book &c.* as Opposed to *Praying and Preaching Within Book*, are Matters *Most Trifling* to be insisted upon; I think you are much in the Right; and shall only add, that you would do well to Act accordingly, Not to keep up a *Separation* on account of Such Matters as are by your own Confession *Most Trifling*.

Well, but it seems the aforesaid *Parallel* brings to mind (What? Why it might have been reasonably expected in consideration of Mr. Dowley's Great Gra

Purity, a Text of Scripture; or at least in consideration of Mr. Dowley's Great Learning, a saying out of some great Author: but no such matter, Mr. Dowley's Gravity, and Learning is not so Great, but that He upon Occasion Condescend to take up with *What is said at Billingsgate*. To have thus recourse to Such a saying as *Billingsgate*, is What one would not think strange among a Company of Porters, or a Crew of Fellows who have been Bred up at Horses heels: but it seems very Unbecoming Mr. Dowley, who pretends to have been Bred at least at the feet of some (Puritan) Gamaliel.

What what is it that is reported of *Billingsgate*? Why, that the Greatest W-re shall be Sure to cry W-re first. Hah! What is the matter now? What, have We got in this Fine saying a Paw Word, which is not fit to be written? Why did not Mr. Dowley's Gravity and Purity prevail upon him to let quite alone the mentioning of the said Expression, if it could not be mentioned without some offence to Modesty? But Sir, one so Conversant in Scribbles as you are, Surely cannot be Ignorant, that the word [Whore] frequently occurs in the Holy Writings; therefore for you to be afraid, that the Writing of the aforesaid Word in full should defile your Pen and Paper, will be look'd upon as no other than the very Height of ridiculous Squeamishness, and a Scruple (just like the Rest of your Scruples, namely) altogether or downright Antiscriptural. So much for the Original or Rise of your fine saying, your manner of writing it: next for the Design and meaning of It.

If then you dare but stand to the Determination of the *Billingsgate Proverb*, I doubt not but to make it quickly appear, that your Party is the most Blameable. For 'tis notoriously known to All that have any tolerable insight into the History of Our Church Transactions since the Reformation, that your Party at their First Separating from our Communion began to justify such their Practice by Crying out against the Church as the *Whore of Babylon*; and you have ever since maintained and kept up your Separation by no Artifice or Cheat

Cheat more than by Continuing to Cry out *Against* *Papists*. And this is Evident from *De Laune's* Book sent me, where are several Pages to this purpose therefore with what Truth can you say, that my *Parallel the Dissenters to the Papists* is as it were *Crying* *whore* when it appears from *De Laune's* Book, that He had *per-
le'd* the Church of England to the Church of Rome above *years* agoe, and consequently *Cry'd* (in the language of *Fine Proverb*) *Whore First?* and therefore according to inference you make from the said *Proverb*, you have *proved* your Own Party to be (in the language of *Bilkinggate-Proverb*) the *Greatest Whore*.

I salute you, Sir, that Mr. *De Laune's* Book was Occasion of my Drawing up that short *Parallel* (at end of my First Letter) between you and the *Papists*. hearing a little after I was settled here, that the said Book was mightily esteemed by your Party, I procured It before I had drawn up *Either of my Letters*, and find that the Author spent a very considerable part of his Book in drawing a *Parallel between Us and the Papists*: hereupon I thought with my self, that a more likely Method to make your Party sensible of the *Weakness of this Objection* (so much insisted on by you) could not be taken, but by *Turning It upon* your selves, and by shewing that those very Things, wherein you *differ from Us*, and which you *Extoll as peculiar Excellencies* in your way of Worship, you do after all *Agree with the Papists*. And I have missed of my *Aim* herein, but have Got as much as I desired from you in the matter. For it seems obvious and evident enough to a *Common Capacity*, that I have here *Forced you to Allow* What will *Answer and Confute All Objections* made by your Party on this head. For say you "Good is no less Good tho' Evil ones have counterfeited it" cover base designs. The *Pharisees* made Prayer a pretence to Devour Widows Houses; yet is not Prayer a Duty, and to be Neglected and Exploded thereupon. In like manner say I according to your own way of arguing; "Good is no less Good tho' the *Papists* may make use of it: and therefore tho' the *Papists* pray by Form,

not Praying by Form less a Duty, or to be Neglected and exploded thereupon, and All turned into Extempore Prayer: tho' the Papists kneel at prayers, particularly at the Sacrament, use the Cross in Baptism &c. yet these Decenties are not therefore to be presently Cast away". And in the like manner may the far Greatest part of De Witt's Book be Confuted by what you your self are forced to Acknowledge in this your Letter to be no other than Truth. And so you have pretty well quit scores with the said Book. For whereas the said Book (tho' sent by you to Me to be your Voucher) had the Ill manners to tell the Flat Ly to what you were pleased to say at the beginning of your Letter, you at the end of your Letter have added a Truth, which will Answer All (or most part) that follows in the said Book from p. 17 to the end; and likewise the other adjoining Treatise stiled, the Image of a Beast: and so you have took here full Revenge for the affront you met with at the Beginning from your Voucher should have been.

Your mentioning what is said of the Pharisees by our Saviour, viz. that they made Prayer a Pretence to Devour Widows houses, gives me just occasion to pray to God, that He would be pleased to give you such a measure of Grace as to enable you Impartially to Examine your own Conscience as to this Pharisaical Practice, and whether you are not Faulty in the same respect. To which end consider, that 'twas not Barely by Praying, but (as our Saviour assures us) by making Long Prayers, and so pretending that they were more Gifted than others by reason of such long Extempore Prayer (for I suppose you will not Allow they made use of Forms in those Early times.) that the Pharisees were wont to Devour Widows Houses, that is, so as to Insinuate themselves into the Good Opinion of silly Wives as to Get away All they had in Gifts and Presents. And now near this Case comes to that of you and your Followers, too well known to need further Explanation.

Had your skill in matters relating to the Papists been as Great as your Zeal against them, you would have known, that those called by you Roman Missionaries might with more accuracy

accuracy have been called *Romish Missionaries* (the Learned and Accurate Writers having thought fit to serve a Distinction between the two words, *Romish*, the better to Avoid Ambiguity) but this sort of Nicety, it is the more easily Excuseable, and therefore I shall insist no longer upon It, but proceed to serve that what you say of the *Romish Missionaries*, said likewise of you and your Brethren, namely that (as well as they) pretend to the Spirit in Prayer, who are destitute of the Spirit. For is it not justly to be said that such your Pretence is chiefly to Cover Base and is it not Known, that you likewise have wicked purposes in hand, viz. to Deceive poor Ignorant People in which concern their Eternal Salvation? Sir, I assure you the Sincerity and Charity of a Christian, that my Heart Trembles for you and your Brethren, when I consider much your vain Pretensions to the Extraordinary Affusion of the Spirit in Prayer, &c. make way for your Own Others Running into the Sin against the Holy Ghost; thereby you ascribe Unwarrantable Expressions and downright Blasphemies to the Holy Spirit of God; and encourage Every pitifull Ignorant Fellow to be so Impudent Irreligious as Not to be Afraid to Assert Publickly, What He Speaks or writes, is as the Spirit gives him Utterance, so farasmuch as He well knows, that He hath as much power for the Spirit's so Giving him Utterance, as you and your Brethren have.

You do no other than make use of the Popish Jesuit Artifice of Quibbling, when you say, that Praying Extempore took not it's Rise from the Papists, but is as Old as the Bible. For tho' it be True, that Praying Extempore, when Rightly Qualified, it is as Old as the Bible; yet 'tis as True, that Praying Extempore when Not rightly Qualified, but as by you in Opposition to the Lawfull Commands of the Church &c. is not as Old as the Bible, but was brought up amongst Us by the Popish Priests in order to cause Divisions; and hath been ever since kept up by the same senting Teachers to the same end and purpose. Surely that Forms of Prayer are as old as the Bible, as you

not only from the *Lord's Prayer* in the *New Testament*, from several Instances in the *Old Testament*, as *Numb. 6. 24, 25, 26. Dent. 21. 7, 8. &c.* as may be more largely in *Cases of Conscience Resolved* concerning the *Lawfulness of going with Forms of Prayer &c.* Part 2d. Case 5. Where may be seen that Mr. *Clarkson's Learning* was not so, or at least His *Impartiality* was not so Sincere, as to free him from maintaining a Great Falsity, by affirming that *Forms of Prayer* were not in use for some Centuries *Christ*. The Contrary whereof is plainly proved in the *Treatise* above-mentioned, as also in Mr. *Bennet's* judgement from p. 55. to p. 69. and Dr. *Comber's History of* *Scots* c. 1, 2, 3, &c.

That might be further added to shew, that the *Disenting* *Preachers* are in reality little other than *Tools made use of by* *Papists to Destroy the Church of England*, and so to *Restore* *Popery*; I shall have Occasion to take large Notice of It in my next *Treatise*, and so shall Omit It here; only Ob- serving, that you, Sir, and your *Brethren* seem to take Great Pains to Keep your Followers in Deep Ignorance as to Particulars which might tend to Open their Eyes and let them see, that the *Bishops and Ministers of the Church of England* are so far from (what is truly called) *Popery*, that they have been All along the *Main Bulwarks of the Protestant Religion Against the Papists*; and accordingly have been and still are Acknowledged as such by the *Protestant Churches beyond Sea*; tho' you and your Brethren are not Ashamed Falsly to Represent them to your Bi- shed Followers as *Papists*. Wherefore I cannot but take Opportunity to Acquaint your Followers, that the *Compilers of the Common Prayer* were Burnt in the Reign of the *Popish Queen Mary I.* and therefore to be sure were not *Popists*, when they chose to lay down their Lives for the sake of the *Protestant Religion*. And again in the Reign of the late *Popish King James II.* several *Bishops of the Church* were Imprisoned in the Tower, and Tryed, and Ministers of Note in Our Church were suspended &c. for opposing the Designs then on foot to Bring in *Popery*; whilst

D

the

the Dissenters were highly Carested and Favoured by the said Papish King James II. and his Party. And surely nothing more Weighty or Real can be urged to shew, that it is by means of the Dissenters that the Papists hope still to Destroy one time or other the Church of England, and then to Advance Popery upon her Ruin.

I have now gone thro' All the several Hints you threatened me with above; and whether they have done More Hurt to my Cause or yours let the Reader Determine. I shall only observe, that they seem to have been so far from making Good those Two or Three Points or Heads they were Brought for, that they can by no means be Allowed as sufficient to serve for All the Rest.

The only Three Heads you have taken notice of in your Letter, are these, viz. Forms of Prayer, your Presbyterian Ordination, and my Specimen of a Parallel that might be Drawn between you and the Papists. And you have been so far from Disproving the Arguments I have made use of on each of the forementioned Heads, that as to Forms of Prayer you have Asserted What will Justifie it against all Objections and as to my Paralleling you with the Papists you have thereby been forced to Acknowledge What will evidently shew the Weakness of the Objections made by your Party against Us on account of our Agreement with the Papists; and lastly, as to your Ordination you have shewn that you are so Far from Rightly Understanding the Controversy about such Presbyterian Ordination, that you do not Rightly know so much as to Spell the word [Presbyter]: To pass by many other False Spellings which are to be Found in your Letter, tho' I have not so much as taken notice of them, excepting only your [your] [Paraleling], and [Paralel].

How many other Heads be there mentioned in my Letter which you have not so much as Spoken One Word about much less Disproved them? And yet if they hold Good and Cannot be Disproved, your own Practice and that of your Followers must be allowed to be Erroneous and Sinfull. And upon these Considerations I cannot but Believe, that 'twill be thought by All Impartial Judges, that there still remain

With Dr. Wells's Answer.

51

very Great Occasion for you to Write again, if not to *Appear* in Print; notwithstanding All you have been pleased to *Alledge* to the Contrary. Indeed would you deal so *Ingeniously*, as *Openly* to declare (what your *Letter* too plainly intimates to be) the True Reason of your *Forbearing* at present to *Appear* in *Print*, namely, that It is because you think it by no means *Proper* or *Convenient* for you to appear in Print, till you can *Appear* in *True Arguing*, or at least in *True* *Telling*; this is so *Reasonable* an *Excuse* as must be *Allowed* by Me and All Other Persons to be Entirely *Sufficient* and *Satisfactory*. And therefore I shall also forbear to say any more on that Subject, but proceed *Duely* to Consider the *Counsel* you give me in the *Close* of your *Letter*, which is as follows.

Mr. DOWLEY's Letter.

Sir If the *counsel* of one so much below you in names and titles might have any place, I would advise you to turn your thoughts from these weak and beggarly elements to the more weighty matters of Religion, make the faith of christ and the love of God more your study than the advancement of ceremony, which is a best but thing mint *Annise & Cummin*, I am sure it would be more pleasing to god, profitable to your People, & comfortable to your self at last, if your spirit be wholly taken up with form gesture & habit in religion, I must profess to you mine is not, I have matters of greater concern to my self and others to exercise my mind on, & though I have digressed so far to write this privately to you, yet you must look for no more of this nature from me, it is not meet that I should leave the substance to serve ceremony, & so bid you heartily farewell.

your very humble servant
P: Dowley.

Waterworth march 15 :
1708.

Dr. WELLS'S Answer.

Sir, I must say that your Letter is All of a piece, and that as you Begin so you End it with Disproving your self or Self-Contradiction; so that your Counsel is of no use, but to expose the Weakness of the Counsellor, and his great Unfitness for such an Office.

You do not deny but the Requiring Obedience to our Ceremonies is Tithing Mint, Anise and Cummin, and this is abundantly enough to justify the Writing of my Letters; and your Counselling me as if I had not done well therein, only shews that you can give Counsell which is directly contrary to the Counsell of our Saviour himself. For our Saviour in the very same places you refer to (*viz.* Mat. 23. 23. or Luke 11. 42.) expressly saith that the Tithing of Mint &c. and therefore Obedience to Ceremonies (as being the same by your own confession) ought not to be left Undone. Hence may be seen how very Unfit a Person you are to be a Spiritual Guide, since you scruple not to Find Fault with what our Saviour requires; and to Counsell against Doing, what our Saviour expressly Counsells Not to leave Undone; and how plainly Blame-worthy you and your Followers are, whilst you thus Openly Disregard and Despise the Directions of Christ, so far as to Pride your selves, and think your selves Better and Purer Christians than Others, only because you Dare to leave quite Undone, what Christ (however small the matters may be in themselves) hath commanded not to be left Undone. Hence Sir, you may learn, that were you but so Happy as Rightly to Know, what is Pleasing to God, what is Profitable to the People, and what will be Comfortable to your self at the last, you would know, that you Sin even by turning your Thoughts from lawfull Ceremonies (tho' in themselves they were no other than weak and beggerly Elements) so far as to have no Regard thereto: you would know, that, was the Faith of Christ and Love of God duely studied by you, you would be induced thereby to have the same Concern for the Advancement of Ceremony as I have, namely in Order to the Decent Performance of Religious Worship, in due Obedience

lawfull Injunctions of our Church-Governours, and lastly above all as a means to Restore the Primitive Peace and Unity of the Church, a matter of the very Highest Importance, we learn from our Saviour, John 17. 21, 22, 23. and other places of Scripture: you would know that your Spirit ought to be taken up (in the same measure as mine is) even in Form, Gesture, and Habit in Religion; and that there should be no Matters of so great Concern to your self and others, as to Excuse you in the sight of God from Exercising your Power, and even upon those things which you now Mind not at all; lastly, you would know, that your Regard to Substance will not excuse your Disregard to Ceremony; and that there is no need to Leave the Former to Serve the Latter, but that Both may and ought to be duely attended upon, and so by every true Christian.

Thus you may see, how very Ill your Counsel is even in this Particular of it, and that you sadly stand in need of Counsel your self, and of some one to be your Spiritual Guide to the Knowledge of the Truth, from which you are at present very Distant. And whereas you say, that tho' you have Digressed thus far to Write this Privately to me, yet I must not expect for no more of this Nature from you; 'tis not unlikely but others may think that your Letter may indeed be very well taken upon as one Long Digression, being very little to the purpose; and that you had consulted your own Credit much more, had you never sent to me Any thing of the Nature of your Letter is of.

I shall only add, that for my part I am and ever shall be very Ready to do you Any Charitable Office in my Power, should you give me Leave. But by your Bidding me Heartily Farewell, you seem Not to care for my Company, but to be Glad to be Rid of it: however my Charity to you will not let me to Part with you wholly yet, but only for some (no long) time, 'till I can get Ready what else I judge may (or at least ought to) be Serviceable and Beneficial to the Unwinding of you and your Followers, and to the Bringing you out of the Thick Darknes of Erroneous Prejudices and Sinfull Enclinations into the Light and Acknowledgment of the Truth.

To this Great End I shall close All with most Earnest
 Beseeching *Almighty God* for the sake of his Beloved Son
 our Loving Saviour *Jesus Christ*, to Deliver You and
 Followers and all Others in the like sad and deplorable
 State, from *All false Doctrine and Schism*, from *Hard
 Heart and Contempt of his Word and Commandment*.

So shall continually pray

Your most Faithfull and

Affectionate Servant in Christ

Catesbach, March 25th.
 1706.

EDW. WELLS



oft Earth
loved Son
ou and
nd depl
n Harb
ent.

and

at in Chr

WEL